Negative microfilm
received from
university

Mic 60–6940

SOLOMON, Daniel. INFLUENCES ON THE DECISIONS OF ADOLESCENTS.

University of Michigan, Ph.D., 1960
Social Psychology

University Microfilms, Inc., Ann Arbor, Michigan

INFLUENCES ON THE DECISIONS OF ADOLESCENTS

by

Daniel Solomon

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in the
University of Michigan
1960

Doctoral Committee:

Professor John R.P. French, Jr., Chairman
Assistant Professor William L. Hays
Professor Daniel Katz
Professor Ronald Lippitt
Professor William C. Morse

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Numerous people have given me assistance of one kind or another at various stages of this study. I am indebted to the members of my committee, and particularly the chairman, J.R.F. French, Jr., who was the principal investigator for the project from which this study was taken, and who provided many thoughtful criticisms and suggestions regarding each phase of the study. I also owe a great deal to Ted Curtis and Sheila Zipf who collaborated on the planning and data gathering phases of the study, as well as early portions of the data analysis.

The study has also been dependent on the cooperation of a great many other people: interviewers, coders, machine operators, statistical clerks, statisticians, high school principals, assistant principals, testing officers, and home-room teachers, as well as 375 Michigan high school students.

This study is taken from a project which was given part of a general "Human Resources Research" grant made by the Michigan State Legislature to the University during the 1957-58 academic year.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF TABLES	v
Chapter	
I. THEORY	1
Introduction	1
Theory	3
Power	5
Relevance and Appropriateness	12
Influence of Power and Relevance on the Decision	18
Conformity to Coercive Influence	24
Additional Variables	32
The Development of Orientations to Influence	32
Criteria of Appropriateness	40
II. PROCEDURES AND VALIDATIONS OF OPERATIONS	42
Procedures	42
Design	42
Sample	42
Operations	44
Validity	51
Power	51
Relevance	54
Guide Identification	56
Coerciveness	59
Need for Independence	60
Coding Reliability	61
III. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITUATIONS	62
Impulse and Value Reasons	62
Guide Agreements and Conflicts	67
Relevance Structure	73
Percentage of Relevance	73
Strength of Relevance	83
Effect of Social Class on Relevance	89
Summary	98

Chapter

Page

IV. ASSOCIATION OF POWER, NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE, AND PARENTAL COERCIVENESS WITH RELEVANCE . . . 102

Power and Relevance. 102
Need for Independence and Relevance. 109
Parental Coerciveness and Relevance. 113
Summary. 117

V. SOME DETERMINANTS AND CORRELATES OF POWER. . . . 118

Power Means Over-all, by Sex and by Grade. . . 118
Coercion and Need for Independence, by Sex and Grade. 127
Power by Social Class. 129
Coerciveness and Need for Independence by Social Class 131
Power, Parental Coercion, and Need for Independence Intercorrelations 133
Family Coercion Patterns and Identification. . 140
Summary. 145

VI. PREDICTION OF THE DECISION 146

Influence of Power and Relevance on the Decision 146
Differences in Guide Influence by Situation and Sex. 158
Conformity to Coercive Influence 166
Summary. 171

VII. SUMMARY OF MAJOR RESULTS 173

The Theory and Its Test. 173
Determinants of the Independent Variables. . . 175

APPENDIXES

A. ESTIMATION OF SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS. 178

B. SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE. 181

C. INSTRUMENTS. 187

Inventory. 188
Interview. 201

LIST OF REFERENCES 224

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1.	First Guide Mentioned in Projective Question. .	56
2.	Proportions of Impulse and Value Responses to Impulse and Value Questions.	58
3.	Reported Parental Coerciveness and Expected Punishment.	60
4.	General Reasons Categories, by Situation. . . .	65
5.	Per Cent Agreement between All Pairs of Guides.	69
6.	Per Cent Relevant by Situation and Sex.	74
7.	Mean Strength of Relevance by Sex for Four Hypothetical Situations	85
8.	Per Cent of Relevance by Class, Sex, and Situation	90
9.	Mean Strength of Relevance by Class, Sex, and Situation	96
10.	Characteristics of the Situations	99
11.	Per Cent of Guide Relevance by Power Grouping for Four Real Situations.	103
12.	Mean Strength of Relevance Scores by Power Groupings for Four Hypothetical Situations. .	105
13.	Per Cent of Parental Relevance by Need for Independence and Sex.	111
14.	Per Cent of Parental Relevance by Parental Coerciveness and Sex.	114
15.	Mean Power, Coercion, and Need for Independence by Sex and Grade.	120
16.	Mean Power by Class and Sex	129
17.	Mean Coerciveness and Need for Independence Scores by Class and Sex	132

Table		Page
18.	Correlations between Power, Need for Independence, and Parental Coerciveness	134
19.	Father and Mother Dominance in Coercion by Sex	141
20.	Ranked Power Scores by Coercion Patterns and Sex	142
21.	Mean Need for Independence Scores by Coercion Pattern and Sex	143
22.	Multiple Regression Analysis.	148
23.	Conformity to Parents by Sex, Observability, and Coerciveness.	167
24.	Most Frequent Reasons, by Situation and Sex . .	182

CHAPTER I

THEORY

Introduction

The decision can be considered an intermediate point between an individual's reception of various influences (of internal and external origin) urging him to move in various directions, and his behavioral reaction to these influences. It is the point at which the various elements of relevance to a situation are confronted, rationally or irrationally, consciously or unconsciously, and a single line of action is chosen on the basis of this confrontation.

The present study investigates the process by which decisions are made by adolescents in a variety of areas. The theory of decision-making presented is not intended to be limited to adolescents, although the situations utilized were designed to be relevant to them particularly, and the influence sources which were studied were those which have been found to be most important to adolescents.

There are two general concerns: what determines the effectiveness of an influence attempt; and how do the various influences combine to produce the decision? Several sources have been useful in helping to indicate a set of specific influences on which to concentrate attention in the investigation. In two studies conducted by the Survey Research Center,

adolescents have reported their behavior to be strongly influenced by parents in most situations, and by peers in some situations (Douvan and Kaye, 1958; Withey and Douvan, 1955). Parental influence has also been found to be important by Brodbeck (1954) and by Rose (1956). Parsons (1949a), among others, has stressed the growing importance of the "peer group culture" for the adolescent, and Neiman (1954) has found that as adolescence progresses, peers are increasingly more influential than parents in the development of certain attitudes. The emphasis Anna Freud (1947) places on the resurgence of long-repressed impulses in adolescence, as well as the general emphasis of the psychoanalytic school on internal conflicts and tensions, and on the description of the development and function of the superego (Freud, 1930), suggests that both "values" and "impulses" should be considered as important sources of influence on the decisions of adolescents. Kallen (1957), in a study investigating the determinants of certain decisions of adolescents, found that parents, peers, and "own ideas" (which one would assume to include both values and impulses), were all important influencers, though there were some variations with the situation, and with certain other independent variables which have no relevance to the present study. These four are the influences on which attention is concentrated in the present study: parents, peers, impulses, and values.

The adolescent seems to represent a particularly good object for the study of decisions; in him the conflicting forces which make decisions difficult stand out more explicitly than in the adult, and their modes of combination or resolution may

therefore be more readily observable. Lewin (1951, p. 143) has described the marginal position of the adolescent, the unfamiliarity of the new region between childhood and adulthood. This unfamiliarity, plus the fact that for the first time, he has decisions to make which will have long-range consequences perhaps makes the adolescent highly aware of the process by which he makes decisions.

Theory

The purpose of the present theory is to identify those variables which produce decision behavior and to specify the ways in which they produce it. The decision situation is viewed as entailing a process of simultaneous reaction to forces originating from the four influence sources. The magnitude of the force from each influence source is determined by three factors; power, relevance, and appropriateness. Power is a potentiality for influence which is based on a general and internalized orientation in the individual toward accepting influence from a given source. Relevance refers to the exertion of an act of influence on an individual, urging a particular decision; this act can occur with varying strengths. The recipient of influence must perceive the situation to be "appropriate" (or fitting) for the influence of a given source before that influence can have an effect. The decision is the outcome of the convergence of forces from the four influence sources, each force produced by the combination of power, relevance, and appropriateness.

The influence sources are called "behavior guides," and defined as follows:

External Guides

1. Parents: Adult authority figures with whom the child lives, whether they are the biological parents or not.

2. Peers: The small group of primary, intimate, "chums."

Internal Guides

3. Impulses: A set of present or potential tensions, each of which has a definite goal, a constant strength, can be activated in appropriate specific situations, and can be reduced by immediate gratifications or by actions instrumental to more deferred gratifications.

4. Values: A set of relatively permanent internalized standards for judging behavior, each of which has a constant strength, and can be activated and satisfied in appropriate specific situations.

A "situation" as referred to in the latter two definitions, and throughout this study, is any instance when the individual makes, or attempts to make a decision.

Internal guides have approximately the same relationship to their particular acts of influence as do external guides. An act of influence is produced by each type of guide in its own way; external guides, by urging the individual to decide in a certain way; internal guides, by having a particular value or impulse activated. A particular value or impulse represents a potential influence. It has a constant strength, and a limited set of goals (for impulses) or actions (for values) which can satisfy it. It is activated when the appropriate situation occurs, and then produces its influence. Stimuli from the situation determine the extent of the activation. These stimuli provide criteria for determining "appropriateness" (some of these will be discussed later); the greater is the perceived appropriateness, the more completely will the impulse or value be activated.

"Activation," as used here, is similar to Atkinson's (1957) notion of arousal of motivation. In his theory, situational characteristics determine the perceived expectancy of goal-attainment, and the more a situation appears goal-relevant, the more the relevant "motive" is aroused. A particular value or impulse, then, activated in a particular situation, produces a force on an individual which is comparable (in its effects) to that of a particular influence attempt in a given direction made by an external guide.

In general, the behavior guides are considered to be anything internal or external to the individual which may be the source of particular forces on him, in particular situations. Although the particular guides which have importance for decisions undoubtedly vary from one age group to another, the process by which influence is exerted by important guides should be the same for individuals of all ages.

Power, relevance, and appropriateness, the three conditioning factors which determine the effectiveness of influence of each of the guides, will now be examined.

Power

Although power has usually been investigated as a relationship between an individual and other persons in his environment, there would seem to be no theoretical reason for not extending it to include internal as well as external behavior guides. Lewin, following his definition of power as a "possibility of inducing forces" (1951, p. 40), specifically includes values as "constructs which have the same psychological dimension

as power fields" (1951, p. 41). Some other definitions do not seem to leave open this possibility:

> Social power is: (1) the potentiality (2) for inducing forces (3) in other persons (4) toward acting or changing in a given direction. (Lippitt, Polansky, Redl, and Rosen, 1952, p. 624; underlining added).
>
> . . . we defined power as potential influence of some individual or group O over an individual P. (Raven and French, 1958a; underlining added.)

The type of influence potentiality described in the latter two definitions does not differ from that postulated by Lewin. It seems legitimate to extend the definition of power to as many influence sources as fulfill the general requirements of that definition. The following is the definition of power used in the present study.

> Power: That potential influence of a behavior guide on an individual, which is entirely based on the strength of the orientation in the individual toward accepting the influence of that guide.

Power is conceived to be an interdependent relationship between the behavior guide and the individual. The individual's orientation toward accepting the influence of a given guide is an important determinant of the extent to which that guide can potentially exert effective influence. The guide's power is based on the individual's readiness to accept it. French and Raven (1959) have discussed the five "bases of social power." These are the types of reasons behind the individual's readiness to accept influence, and include reward, coercion, perceived legitimacy, reference (or identification of the individual with the influencer), and perceived expertness. In this study, the central concern is not in the investigation of the different bases of power, but in the fact

that bases exist, that the orientation of the influencee is a determinant of the power of the influencer. Attention is focused on this internal orientation; it is considered crucial to the present conception of power.

It is assumed that individuals have simultaneous orientations toward accepting the influence of each of the behavior guides. The relative strengths of these various orientations may differ for a given individual. The strength of a given orientation, however, remains relatively constant across situations. Power, then, is held to be a relatively long-lasting and stable aspect of the relationship between the individual and the guide.

The stability and relative permanence which are here called properties of the orientations on which power is based are characteristics also typically involved in definitions of personality, or personality traits. This is not unintentional, and it will perhaps be helpful to make it explicit. The interaction involved in the present theory in the production of a decision can be viewed as a confrontation of the immediate and somewhat unique demands of a particular situation with the characteristic and relatively permanent demands of the given individual.

Viewing power as based solely on an internal orientation which exists independently of the specific situations in which it is utilized involves some changes from the French and Raven view of power. The extent to which a situation fulfills certain general criteria of "appropriateness" is an important determinant of at least four of the five types of power which

they identify. A guide's legitimacy is defined in terms of a general type, or group of types of situations in which its influence is acceptable. The expertness of a guide similarly ranges over a definite and limited series of types of situations. Coercive and reward power can only be utilized effectively in those situations in which the guide can realistically threaten or promise punishments or rewards. The present approach differs from that of French and Raven in that it attempts to separate distinctly the individual's general orientation toward accepting a guide's influence (the orientation on which power is based) from all aspects of that influence which may vary from one situation to another, including the fulfillment of appropriateness criteria and the specific influence attempts in particular situations. The general orientation toward accepting influence is reserved to be the base of power, while the situational variants are the determinants of appropriateness and relevance. This distinction will be returned to in the following section.

It will be apparent that the orientation toward accepting the influence of an external guide (and therefore the power of a guide) is something different from any particular influence attempt made by the guide. It should be emphasized that the same is true for impulses and values. The writer has said that the activation of a particular impulse or value is analogous to the influence attempt of an external guide, both being produced only in certain specific situations. The base of power is an orientation (which remains constant across situations) toward accepting the influence of a guide in

general; this is equally true for internal and external guides. For example, an individual may have a weak orientation toward following the influence of his impulses, and consequently low power for impulses. In one situation (a decision concerning a party, perhaps, some particular impulse may be strongly activated, however; while in another (making plans for the future), no impulses may be activated at all. The power of the guide is the same in both situations; its magnitude is independent of the degree to which any particular impulse is activated.[1]

The four sources which are distinguished are considered equally potential influencers. Theoretically, an individual can give any one of them his strongest orientation, or can have any pattern of relative strengths of orientations toward all the guides, but some patterns would be expected to be more typical than others for a given age group.

Considering a dominant orientation toward accepting influence from a single source as a stable personality charac-

---

[1] "Activation," as used here, refers only to the internal guides, and only to their particular manifestations. It is not an activation of the orientation on which power is based. The general orientation involved in the power conception refers to a "generalized" guide (akin to "superego" with respect to values; "id" with respect to impulses); it is not considered to require activation. It is constant and is always within the individual. An act of relevance, on the other hand, consists of an instance of activation of a particular value or impulse (such as honesty or sexual desire) in a particular instance. These specific activations vary from situation to situation. But the power of the guide may be considered related to the individual's general attitude toward that guide, his general evaluation of its influence (hence his orientation toward accepting its influence). It is different from (and independent of) any specific activated value (for instance) in any specific situation. It refers to all instances of relevance equally (to all possible values for value power, and all possible impulses for impulse power).

teristic has some general precedents. Adorno et al. (1950) discuss the character type who seeks strong guidance from authority figures. Riesman makes the distinction between those individuals whose major direction is from "inner" sources, and those for whom it is from their contemporaries (1953). And psychoanalysts (for instance, Fenichel, 1945) have spoken of individuals who are "impulsive" as well as those who are dominated by a strong superego. The present intention is not to say that a dominant orientation toward one of the guides, or even a pattern of orientations constitutes a character type in itself. But the pattern of orientations toward influence for a given individual constitutes a character-related structure which the individual carries with him from situation to situation, and which at least partially determines the way the individual will react to attempts at influence from the various guides.

As power has been defined, it also implicitly contains a motivation in the individual for conformity with a guide. Power is based on the individual's orientation toward accepting the influence of the guide. And this orientation is based on the general gratifications which the individual can expect to obtain simply from conforming to the influence of the guide. The stronger is the orientation, the greater can be the expected gratification from conformity. This gratification may take the form of achieving rewards, avoiding punishments, or maintaining the love of, or sense of identification with external guides. For values, it may involve achieving a relief from guilt or producing feelings of pride, righteousness, or elation; while for impulses, it involves the general reduction

of tension. These orientations do not vary in strength between situations, but situations vary in the extent to which a guide gives definite influence; and therefore in the extent to which it is actually possible to achieve the gratification connected with conforming to each source. That is to say, the guides vary in their relevance and appropriateness from situation to situation, but not in their power.

Cartwright (1959) refers to the individual's "motive base" (which includes all that is usually meant by "need," "motive," "drive," "tension system" or "instinct") as necessarily being "tapped" by an influence attempt before a force can be activated. This is quite similar to the notion presently being advanced, although his "motive base" seems to refer to all types of possible gratifications in a situation, while "power" in the present approach involves only the motivation for conformity to guides.

The gratification involved in a decision situation is divided into two sources; that to be obtained from conforming to powerful guides, and that to be obtained from achieving the specific desired goal of the decision, as the result of activity which the decision instigates. In Lewinian terms, this can be conceived to be a division between "path" and "goal," with conformity to influence from certain guides being the path toward obtaining the ultimately desired goal which is to be achieved by taking the action decided upon. Lewin discusses the possibility that intermediate regions on the path to a positively valent goal may take on valence in their own right (1938, pp. 92-94). To the extent that a guide is powerful,

the gratification involved in conforming to its influence may similarly constitute a sub-goal in the decision situation. The major motivational role in the decision situation is given to this sub-goal gratification. For the decision-making individual is conceived to be beset by advice from various sources, internal and external. Making the decision necessarily involves conforming to some of these sources' advice, and deviating from that of others. The importance which the individual places on his conformity in itself to the influence of each of the guides then becomes crucial. The gratification to be obtained from achieving the more ultimate goal is not neglected, but is seen as only one of the gratifications involved in the situation.

Relevance and Appropriateness

The guides differ in the degree to which they exert influence in any given situation. This exertion of influence is called "relevance," and is defined as follows:

> Relevance: The indication of a direction for change (or the influence for non-change), either in the form of a path or a goal.

Relevance constitutes an exertion of influence which is quite similar to the "act of an agent" notion of Cartwright's power schema (1959). He considers an "agent" ". . . any entity which can produce effects or suffer consequences" (1959, p. 189). Before this agent can produce an influence,

> . . . it must be "active" in some fashion. The event, associated with the agent, which activates an effect is here termed an "act". . . . Acts may produce effects within the life space of the agent performing the act or in the life space of another agent. In the latter case, the act is usually called an "influence attempt." (1959, p. 189.)

Internal guides, in the present scheme, produce effects from within the individual's own life space, while the external guides' influence originates from without. Cartwright's precedent will be followed here in calling an occasion of exertion of influence from any source an "act" of relevance.

To reiterate, this "act" takes different forms for the different guides. For the external guides, it may consist of an exhortation, command, request, look of reproach; while for the internal, it is produced in any instance when a particular impulse or value is activated. The extent to which the internal guides are activated depends on the individual's perception of the situation's "appropriateness" for the influence of the particular impulse or value involved. Perceptions of appropriateness are also used to judge the acceptability of the acts of the external guides. However, these perceptions have no influence on whether or not the external guide produces an act of relevance. Since the guide is external, the individual's perceptions can have no direct effect on its behavior.

Whenever a guide has acted, no matter how weak an act it is, that guide is relevant to the situation. If the given situation is similar to previously experienced ones, the individual may respond to an imagined act (based on generalization from the previous situations), without an act having been produced by the guide. An imagined act still constitutes a palpable exertion of influence.

External guides are relevant when:

1. The guide has clearly indicated to the individual which alternative he (or they) thinks is best.
2. The guide has, in past situations similar to the given

one, expressed his opinion as to which is the best alternative.

Impulses are relevant when:

1. The individual perceives that a particular impulse can be immediately gratified in the situation, or a future impulse gratification can be approached, in one of the decision alternatives.

2. The situation is similar to previous ones in which gratification of the particular impulse has been attempted, either in the immediate or the deferred sense.

Values are relevant when:

1. The individual perceives that a particular value can be fulfilled, in one of the decision alternatives.

2. The situation is similar to previous ones in which fulfillment of the particular value has been attempted.

The "strength" of relevance is defined as the strength of the act produced by the guide. For the external guides, the strength of the act is communicated to the individual as the guide's intensity of desire for conformity; for the internal guides, the strength of the act depends both upon the underlying strength of the particular value or impulse involved and the degree to which it is activated in the given situation.

Appropriateness is the individual's perception that the situation meets one or more criteria which make influence from a given guide justified, fitting, or proper. Criteria for determining appropriateness for both internal and external guides are learned, and some of these criteria may be included in an individual's system of values. It would be considered "proper" for instance, for an individual to be influenced by his peers in a situation concerning a party, but not one involving a family reunion. Legitimacy is one general criterion of appropriateness, and may be the one which is mainly included in

the individual's values. French and Raven (1959) maintain that the range of situations in which a power-holder's influence is considered legitimate is defined by the individual's internalized values. Some other criteria of appropriateness are the individual's perception of a guide's "expertness" or competence to give good advice in a given particular situation, and the extent to which the situation is perceived as one in which certain overt incentives (such as avoidance of punishment, attainment of specific rewards, gratification of particular impulses, fulfillment of particular values) can actually be obtained. Appropriateness is somewhat similar to what Schacter (1953) has called "relevance." He defines this as an ordering of activities in terms of their importance to the group, and, by implication, to the individuals within the group. Appropriateness is related to the importance which the individual perceives a guide's influence to have for a given situation. An individual feels an obligation to admit the influence of an appropriate guide for consideration.

As has been indicated, this is giving to appropriateness part of what French and Raven include under the power construct. The present position does not differ from theirs in the totality of elements which are held ultimately to influence the individual, but only in the identification of the factors which are broken into separate constructs. It is believed that influence is a relationship between the individual, the guide, and the situation, and that the factors involved in this relationship can be viewed in terms of the generality of the situations to which they apply.

From the discussion of the relationship in the preceding pages, three levels of generality emerge; represented in power, appropriateness, and the act of relevance. Power was defined as a potentiality for influence based on the individual's orientation toward accepting influence from a guide. This orientation is general, and held to be constant through all situations. As such, it is at the most general level of the relationship. Two other factors are included as determinants of influence; the appropriateness of the situation for influence from a certain source, as perceived by the individual, and the strength of the particular act of relevance. The appropriateness of the situation refers to the extent to which the situation fulfills certain general criteria; as such it is at a relatively general level. A particular situation is appropriate for the influence of a certain guide because it has one or more characteristics which a limited number of other situations also have. The act of influence occurs in a single, particular situation; it is at the most specific level of the three.

French and Raven include the first two levels, the potentiality of influence based on the individual's orientation, and the situation's fulfillment of certain general criteria, under "power." The general criteria which the situation can manifest under the second level are legitimacy, expertness, and the realism with which threats and promises of punishments and rewards can be made. The present position, however, reserves "power" for only the <u>most</u> general of these levels; it is based on an orientation which is held to cut across all types of situations. The two latter levels of generality comprise the present "relevance" and "appropriateness."

The relationship between appropriateness and the act of relevance is somewhat different for internal than for external guides. Theoretically, the external guide can exert influence even when the individual does not consider him appropriate to the situation; conversely the external guide can refrain from acting even though he is considered appropriate. Yet it is presumed that influence attempts are made, for the most part, in "appropriate" situations, if both parties involved agree as to the relevant criteria of appropriateness. But the act of an internal guide consists of a specific activation of a specific impulse or value, and this activation is only produced when the situation promises specific impulse tension reduction or value fulfillment; that is to say, when it is perceived to be appropriate. The more appropriate the situation, the more the particular value or impulse is activated. Appropriateness, then, defines activation (and therefore relevance) for the internal guides (but <u>not</u> for the external).

In the following table, the characteristics of power, strength of relevance, and appropriateness are presented for internal and external guides:

Guide	Base of Power	Appropriateness	Strength of Relevance
External	Orientation toward accepting influence of guide in general.	Situation's fulfillment of one or more criteria (including legitimacy, expertness, potential for reward or punishment).	Strength of a particular influence attempt in a particular direction, in a particular situation.
Internal	Orientation toward accepting influence of guide in general.	Situation's fulfillment of one or more criteria (including potential for gratification of	Strength of a particular impulse or value, activated in a particular

Appropriateness	Strength of Relevance
particular impulses, fulfillment of particular values).	situation, influencing in a particular direction.

Relevance and appropriateness are manifested through the impinging of stimuli on the individual. For the external guides, these stimuli originate from two sources, both external. The act of relevance constitutes a stimulus which comes directly from the external guide. The quality of the situation itself, its fulfillment of the appropriateness criteria with which the individual judges the influence attempt, constitutes another set of stimuli from an external source. The internal guides have a similar relation to the stimuli of situational appropriateness. And they also produce an act of relevance, which, in their case, constitutes a stimulus from an internal source.

Influence of Power and Relevance on the Decision

The major hypotheses of the study will be presented in this section. These attempt to state the expected importance of the independent variables which have been discussed to the actual behavior of making a decision. Although the theory thus far has treated appropriateness as one of the determinants of the decision, this variable is not utilized in the specific hypotheses of this study. It is assumed, however, that an external guide usually produces an act of relevance only in those situations for which its influence is appropriate, while an internal guide produces an act of relevance whenever it is appropriate.

Power and relevance are each expected to be influential to decisions. The magnitude of the force emanating from each guide depends on the combination of power and relevance (given a certain degree of appropriateness). Most influence should be found when this combination is investigated. The decision should be accurately predicted by consideration of the forces produced by all four guides simultaneously.

Hypothesis 1a: The stronger the force exerted by a guide (the product of power and strength of relevance), the greater will be its influence on a decision.

Hypothesis 1b: The total "resultant" force, produced by all four guides simultaneously, should accurately predict the decision.

The major assumption involved in these hypotheses is that the force is the product of the two factors. This multiplicative model seems appropriate for the type of personality-situation interaction involved in the present scheme, particularly because of the property that one variable can produce no effect if the other has a magnitude of zero.

Hypothesis 1a refers to the influence of guides considered separately; 1b to the combination of all the guides. It is expected that more than one guide exerts influence in any given situation, and that the resultant decision will be in the direction indicated with the greatest total force. In a simple decision with only two alternatives, a force could be computed in the direction of each of the alternatives, composed of the sum of the forces of all the guides indicating that direction. The resultant force, and the predicted decision, would then be in the direction of the greater force.

This usage of "resultant force" is in agreement with

that of Lewin, who calls it, "the combination of a number of forces acting at the same point at a given time. . . ." However there are some differences between the present theory and that of Lewin regarding the components of forces. Lewin states:

> The strength of the force toward or away from a valence depends upon the strength of that valence and the psychological distance between the person and the valence. . . . (1951, p. 258.)

There is an unfortunate double meaning to the term "valence" in this sentence. In the first instance it represents the central region of a "positive central field" (1951, p. 257) toward which forces are oriented, while in the second instance it seems to represent the attractiveness of that field as a goal to the individual. In another section of the same paper, Lewin says that needs are related to valences:

> An increase in the intensity of need . . . leads to an increase of the positive valence of certain activities. . . . Any statement regarding change of needs can be expressed by a statement about certain positive and negative valences. (1951, p. 273.)

In this sense, valence is the same as the activation of particular impulses in the present scheme, for impulses are goal-related entities which can be satisfied by achieving specific goals in situations in which they are activated, and as such are also similar to "needs." But the expected gratification of impulses associated with achieving particular goals is not the only motivating force in the present theory. More important is that gratification to be gained through conformity to powerful guides.

The other term in Lewin's postulate concerning the factors influencing the strength of force is "psychological distance." This can be considered to fill somewhat the same

function as relevance in the present scheme, since relevance helps define the extent to which it is actually possible to obtain the desired gratification from any of the sources in a given situation.

Other theories use "subjective probability" rather than psychological distance as a factor involved in the production of a force. One is the theory of Rotter (1954) which involves two factors in the influence of behavior, "reinforcement value" (which is somewhat similar to "valence") and "expectancy" (which would seem to be precisely the same as "subjective probability"). Another is the decision theory in the game theory tradition, which postulates "utility" and "subjective probability" as the two elements of importance in decisions under "risk" and/or "uncertainty" (Luce and Raiffa, 1957).

In one sense, the notion of "relevance" is closely related to that of "subjective probability" and in another it is not. It was stated that the gratification to be achieved in a decision situation may be divided into two parts, that which results from reaching the goal region, and that which results from conforming to powerful guides. The subjective probability or expectancy of the other theories refers to the probability of a path leading to a goal, or the probability of a goal's existing. But it is assumed that the attainment of the goal satisfies some particular impulse. Appropriateness is then related to this subjective probability for impulses. For one kind of appropriateness defines the individual's perception of the extent to which particular impulses can be fulfilled in a particular situation. The more appropriate the situation for

the influence of a particular impulse the more chance of attaining the goal of that impulse. Because an internal guide is activated (and therefore relevant) whenever it is appropriate, impulse-relevance is also related to the subjective probability of goal attainment. The gratification involved in the attainment of the goals of particular impulses however, is not as important a motivating force in the present theory as that to be obtained merely by following the influence of the guide. Subjective probability in the other theories does not refer to the attainment of these latter gratifications, but relevance does. Gratification from conformity can occur only if the guide is relevant, and the more strongly the guide is relevant the greater is the likelihood that following the influence of the guide will indeed produce the desired gratification. Relevance determines when the orientation on which power is based can actually be followed by providing a specific direction in which a decision may be made.

There are some studies whose results are relevant to hypotheses 1a and 1b. Kallen (1957) measured the "action" and "value" bases of inner- and other-directed subjects. The "action" base was the perception the person had concerning which of two general types of influence (that from "inner" or that from "other" sources) he characteristically accepted; the "value" base, his perception of the type of influence he believed it right to accept. Neither are precisely the same as the inner orientation involved in the present conception of power, but the value base would seem to approximate it the more closely of the two. The subjects were presented with two

general types of situations, a conflict with parents ("Shall I do what my parents want me to do or what I think is right?") and a conflict involving peers ("How can I be myself and still go along with the gang?"). They were asked to give a specific example of each type of conflict, and then responded to questions about the examples. It was found that subjects reporting different value-based orientations were differently responsive to influence in the decision situations. The value-based inner-directeds accepted influence from parents in the parental conflict situation, but not from peers in the peer-conflict situation. Conversely, the value-based other-directeds accepted influence in the peer conflict situation, but not in the parental-conflict situation. Though the act of relevance seems to have been equally strong in the two situations, presumably the appropriateness for influence from the various sources was varying. Thus, influence of "contemporaries" is accepted when the situation involves them only if the individual is oriented generally toward acceptance of that influence. And parents, being the source of inner-directed values, are influential in the parental conflict situation only to those subjects who are inner-directed. The similarity in approach to the present scheme lies in the conception of an interaction between the individual orientation and the specific situation. The present approach, however, puts more emphasis on the strength of the orientation, and on the amount of force put on the individual by the guide in the decision situation.

Some other experiments can be interpreted as having involved variables comparable to power and relevance in

producing decisions. The force on an individual to make certain judgments has been varied by increasing the number of individuals with whom the subject finds himself in disagreement by Asch (1951), and by Helson (1955). Conformity increases with the size of the opposing group from one to three members. The increases in force manifested in these experiments would seem to be reflecting differences in both power and relevance. The multiplicative nature of the present model requires that both power and relevance be greater than zero in order to have any effective influence produced. Assuming that the power of the other individuals in the situations utilized in these experiments was greater than zero, increasing their number would increase the power involved in the situation. Since each of them is indicating his approval of a certain judgment, each is also producing an act of relevance; the more guides indicating a given direction, the stronger is the total relevance of these guides in that direction. Both power and relevance, then, would seem to have been influencing the judgments.

Zipf (1958) used two independent variables in a multiplicative model similar to the present one, to predict conformity to influence in a card-sorting situation. She used situations with two types of incentive to conformity, reward and punishment. The independent variables were valence of reward, or of punishment, and the subjective probability of actually achieving the promised reward, or avoiding the threatened punishment. Neither of these variables is precisely the same as its counterpart in the present study, but each would seem to be somewhat related. The valences of reward and

punishment are related to the power of the external guides in that this power is based on an orientation sometimes motivated by a desire to attain the rewards and avoid the punishments of specific guides. And strength of relevance can be related to subjective probability by assuming that the stronger is an act of relevance the more probable will it seem to the subject that the promised reward or lack of punishment will actually occur. Zipf found that increases in the "induction force" (the product of valence and subjective probability) produced increases in the amount of conformity to the induction.

Three more hypotheses are derived from 1a and 1b, and are based on the properties of multiplication that each term must be greater than zero, and that the value of the product increases as the value of either (or both) of the terms increases.

Hypothesis 2: The more power a guide has, the greater will be its influence on a decision.

Because power is based on the individual's orientation toward being influenced by a given guide, in the present definition, it is logical to assume that the individual will attempt to decide in accordance with those guides which have the most power. This may be difficult, or even impossible, in cases where the guides with the most power are not relevant to the situation. One cannot conform when an influence attempt has not been made. But, if power is an important factor, a guide with at least a minimal amount of relevance and a great degree of power should exert more influence on a decision than one with an equal amount of relevance and less power.

Several studies report results which would tend to

confirm this hypothesis, although none of them use independent variables precisely comparable to the present conception of power, and usually predict to some behavioral reaction to influence other than the decision. Lippitt, Polansky, Redl, and Rosen (1952), for instance, found that "attributed power," as measured by the judgments of children in two summer camps, was related both to contagion and to the acceptance of direct attempts at influence. This was true for the group as a whole and for individual cases as well. That is, individuals who rated someone as "powerful" tended to accept that person's direct and indirect influence. To relate this finding to the present theory, however, it would be necessary to assume that the attribution of power to a guide is related to the orientation to accept the influence of that guide. How valid an assumption this would be is not known.

A study by Helson, Blake, Mouton, and Olmstead (1956) uses an independent variable which fits the present conception of power as an orientation toward the acceptance of influence, but does not relate it to a specific guide. Subjects rated "submissive" on the Allport-Allport A-S Reaction Study conformed more in their judgments of attitude statements to the judgments of paid participants than did those rated "ascendant." Submissiveness was also found to be related to conformity by Kelman (1950).

Wells, Weinert, and Rubel (1956), and Crutchfield (1955), found authoritarians (as measured by the F scale) more susceptible to influence from other individuals than equalitarians. Authoritarianism approaches the present independent variable

somewhat more closely in that it identifies a particular type of guide to be influential; yet these studies do not relate it to the acceptance of influence from authoritarian sources. Subjects high in "other-directed" values were found by Bell (1955) to be more influenced by reading articles attributed to authoritative sources than subjects high in "inner-directed" values. This approaches the power conception, identifying a general source of influence as the power holder and investigating the conformity to influence from that source. The major difference from the present scheme is that these sources are somewhat more inclusive than are the "guides."

Zipf (1958), in the study mentioned earlier, found individual's conformity to increase with increases in the valence of reward considered separately, when this was used as the incentive, and with increases in the valence of avoiding punishment when this was used as the incentive. The writer has said that her use of "valence" is perhaps partially the same as "power."

French and Snyder (1959) found that leader "acceptance" (liking) was related to overt compliant opinion change. Though they are not identical, there is probably some overlap between the orientation toward accepting influence from a guide and one's liking for that guide. For this case, as for most of the other studies reviewed in this section, "power" in the present sense is only approximated.[1]

---

[1]Another group of studies seems to have included both power and appropriateness as independent variables. These studies measured subjects' conformity to statements or judgments made by individuals with varying degrees of "legitimacy" or "expertness" with respect to the requirements of the situation. Art judgments were more influenced, in a study by Mausner

Hypothesis 3: The stronger the relevance of a guide, the greater will be its influence on a decision.

Behind this hypothesis is the additional assumption that the more strongly influence is attempted by a guide on an individual, the more difficult does it become for the individual to ignore the influence of the guide, and the more likely is he to conform to the demands of the guide.

Findings relevant to this hypothesis were obtained in similar experiments by Festinger and Thibaut (1951), and by Gerard (1953). In both these experiments, subjects conformed more in homogeneous groups when there was greater pressure to reach unanimity, either as induced by the instructions (in the former experiment), or by having a second discussion led by an "expert" (in the latter). The pressure for unanimity is somewhat more general than relevance, since it indicates a desired outcome for action but does not specify the means to be used to attain this outcome.

In the Zipf study (1958), conformity was found to be a

(1953), when the subject's "partner" (or influence source) was introduced as an art expert than when he was introduced on equal terms. French and Snyder (1959) found the effectiveness of influence to increase with the influencee's perception of the influencer's expertness in the area of the influence attempt. Raven and French (1958a) found that "legitimately" elected supervisors were able to effect more influence than those who were not so elected. Expertness and legitimacy are qualities which help define a guide's competence for giving advice in certain types of situations, and thereby his appropriateness to these situations. Power was perhaps also represented to some extent in these studies, for the acceptance of legitimate or expert influence is partially dependent on the general orientation toward accepting that influence from particular guides. But legitimate, expert, or any other kind of influence is only effective in the type of situation for which it is appropriate. Appropriateness, then, seems to have been the critical variable in these studies.

function of the subjective probability of achieving the reward or avoiding the punishment. The relation of this variable to relevance has already been discussed.

Hypothesis 4: The force of power times strength of relevance will be a better predictor of the decision than either power or strength of relevance taken separately, both for the individual guides, and for the "resultant forces" of the simultaneous influence of all the guides in a situation.

The same general prediction is made by Zipf, although the independent variables, as has been pointed out, are somewhat different. In her study (1958), the multiplicative model predicted the amount of conformity better than either of the independent variables considered separately.

The foregoing hypotheses have attempted to specify important elements involved in the eliciting of decision-making behavior and to identify their relation to that behavior. The theoretical essence of these hypotheses is the notion of the interaction between power and relevance. That is, while a strong orientation toward a guide's influence should be related to a compliant decision, a strong act of relevance by the guide at the same time gives a definite direction in which to follow the bent of the orientation; similarly an act of relevance, while somewhat influential by itself, gains increased effectiveness when to it is added the motivational backing of a strong orientation toward the guide's influence.

Conformity to Coercive Influence

Hypothesis 5: An individual is more likely to conform to the influence of an external guide who has coercive power over him when he is present (able to observe) than when he is absent. Conformity to

external guides with other bases of power, with the exception of reward, should be less dependent on their presence.

This hypothesis has been proposed previously by power theorists (Raven and French, 1958b) and is a direct, almost definitional derivation from the theory. A power figure whose power over an individual is exclusively or primarily coercive is only able to exert influence effectively when the individual has reason to expect punishment for deviation. If the power figure is not present to observe a deviation, the probability of a punishment resulting from noncompliance is much less than if he is present. This is most opposed, theoretically, to a "reference" power relationship which is based on identification between power holder and reacting individual, where the individual has to some extent internalized the power holder's values, wants to be like him, and therefore does as he says whether he is present or not. Logical as this hypothesis seems, however, three prior experiments in power theory, investigating reactions to inductions in card-sorting tasks (French, Levinger, and Morrison, 1959; Raven and French, 1958b; Zipf, 1958), have not found greater conformity to coercion when the power figure is present than when he is absent. Kelman (1956), in a somewhat related experiment, found that subjects expressed more agreement with a speaker who was perceived by them as having the ability to control financial support for their college when they believed that he would see their responses than when they did not. The facts that the speaker did not make a direct attempt to influence their responses, that he was only an indirect, possible source of punishment

(through his control of the college to which the subjects were committed), and that it was not clearly stated that a lack of compliance would produce the punishment, would seem to give the results added emphasis. For these are all factors which would be expected to weaken the relationship; yet it holds up under these conditions.

In the present theory, the presence and absence of the guide would produce differences in the appropriateness of the guide. The general assumption behind the hypothesis is that the greater is the appropriateness of a given guide in a given situation, the greater is the likelihood of deciding in the direction indicated by the guide. Presence and absence of a coercive power holder are considered to produce differences in appropriateness for the following reason. A coercive guide must be able to observe deviations in order to be able to threaten punishment realistically. The greater the individual's perceived probability of punishment for noncompliance in a given situation, the more appropriate is coercive influence to that situation. An effective way for a coercive guide to increase the appropriateness of his influence in a given situation, then, is to increase the probability of punishment for noncompliance. Punishment from the guide depends on his awareness of noncompliance, and therefore is most likely if he is present in the situation to observe noncompliance. Power based on reward is similar to that based on coercion in that the guide's knowledge of the individual's behavior is necessary for it to be effective. Since reference power, however, does not depend on any specific reaction by the guide, his knowledge of

the actual decision is less necessary for the individual to obtain gratification from conformity.

Appropriateness, then, is increased by the presence of a guide with coercive or reward power, but not one with referent power. If appropriateness is related to conformity to influence, it follows that guide observability under coercive (and reward) power, should also be related to conformity to influence.

Additional Variables

In addition to the major variables, power, relevance, and appropriateness, which have been discussed and whose combination is held to determine the decision, certain other variables have also been included in this study. These are variables which were thought to have possible interesting connections with the major variables, and to be of potential help in investigating the development of particular orientations of sub-groups of adolescents to the various factors of importance to their decision making. Specific hypotheses were not made in connection with these variables since they are not central to the decision theory being advanced. In this section, these variables will be identified, and the problem areas to which they are relevant will be discussed briefly. The additional variables are age, sex, social class and "need for independence."

The Development of Orientations to Influence

The writer has suggested that power, as defined here, is actually a personality-tied variable. Its development can

then perhaps be best understood in terms of personality theory.

Identification is almost universally utilized theoretically as the crucial process in the socialization of the child, and his attainment of values. According to Freud, the identification which is involved in the development of the superego[1] is a direct outcome of the Oedipal conflict (Freud, 1949, 1933, and 1927). The young child develops an object choice toward the parent of the opposite sex. He finds this choice frustrated by the same-sexed parent. The hostility which the frustration inevitably arouses cannot be expressed for fear of loss of love and of extreme physical punishment. It is therefore turned inward, and its energy expended in the development of the superego. The superego is incorporated from that of the frustrating parent through the process of "defensive identification" or "identification with the aggressor" (Freud, 1947), for the best way to avoid the anticipated severe punishment is to be like the punishing agent, to accept his standards for one's own. This is held to be more true for males than females, however. Since the father is held to be the major disciplinarian, he would be the "frustrating agent" for females as well as males. Therefore females, as well as males, are punished by, and incorporate the superego of the father.

The acceptance of these standards does not mean that the individual will behave exactly as does the object of identification; certain behaviors are left to be the prerogative of

---

[1]An earlier, primitive form of identification is also considered by Freud (1949). In this form, it is the "earliest expression of an emotional tie with another person," and helps to prepare the way for the Oedipus complex.

the parent (Freud, 1927). The individual, then, incorporates a set of parental values, some of which provide for similar behaviors between parent and child, and some of which provide criteria of acceptability for various types of behavior appropriate to specific age, sex, and other categories. To apply this to the present theory, it is assumed that among the internalized parental values are those which define the general acceptability of various sources of influence.

Identification has also been conceived to be a process of imitation-learning largely dependent on reward and punishment. According to Seward (1954), love is the necessary basis for identification, and the necessary moderate degree of punishment is not traumatic if this basis exists, whereas severe punishments may lead to behavioral fixations due to the avoidance-avoidance conflicts engendered.

Whiting and Child (1953), with a somewhat similar approach, hold that identification and superego development are dependent simultaneously on both the threat of loss of love and the orientation toward the maintenance of parental love, and therefore that superego development should be more related to love oriented discipline than purely coercive discipline.

The general point of agreement between these theories of identification is that punishment of some kind and to some degree is consistent with identification, if not necessary for it.

Bronfenbrenner, in a recent study (1958b) found that each parent gave more physical punishment to the same-sex child than to the other, and that ". . . among adolescents who are

generally loved and accepted, those youngsters are likely to behave most responsibly in school who more often describe their parents as expressing some degree of dissatisfaction and criticism." If love, acceptance, and responsibility can be considered outcomes of adequate identifications, these findings would indicate that moderate parental disapproval (and perhaps punishment) is consistent with identification, and that the father is not the major disciplinarian for both sexes. Yet it is also possible that the more accepted and responsible children merely are more easily able to admit some measure of conflict with the parents.

Writers vary greatly in the assumed behavioral correlates of identification. It has been described as the child's perceived similarity in specific behavior to that of the object of identification (Sopchak, 1952), actual similarity of behavior (Payne and Mussen, 1956), actual similarity between the general patterns of behavior of the individual and the object of identification (Bronfenbrenner, 1958c), behavior in accordance with the sex role of the object of identification (Parsons, 1949a; Altucher, 1956), and similarity between the ideals of the individual and the object of identification (Helper, 1955). Some of these may be valid criteria simultaneously. If a function of identification is the incorporation of the parental superego, similarity between the parent's and child's "ideals" would be a valid indication of identification. But among these ideals are specific desirable behaviors for given age and sex roles. The notion of value internalization would seem to be most useful for purposes of understanding the development of

standards. Perceived and actual similarity, while they certainly also occur, are less clearly related to the development of values. If the role model assumption is correct, an indirect way of determining the existence of identification is by comparing actual behaviors with the accepted cultural standard for a given role. One of the variables in the present study, need for independence, can be considered to be a probable indicator of the fulfillment of the male and female roles as defined in the American culture, for the following reasons.

Hankins (1943) has said that the major single problem with which the adolescent struggles is that of acquiring independence and individuality. Other writers (Ausubel, 1954, for example) give it a somewhat less major role, but still consider it important in adolescence, for both sexes. Zipf (1958) defines need for independence in terms of power, calling it a predisposition not to conform to the influence of a power holder. This need varies in strength from individual to individual in accordance with its level of tension. Zipf of course only includes other individuals as power holders in this definition; this is most consistent with the usual meaning of independence. This definition of need for independence is approximately the reverse of the base of power for the external guides in the present scheme, for power is based on an orientation toward being influenced, while need for independence is a "predisposition" not to conform. If the independence struggle in adolescence is primarily one of acquiring freedom from parental domination, need for independence should be more negatively related to the power of parents than to that of any other

external guide for adolescents.

In this culture, independence is more of an accepted quality for an adult male, than for a female. Yet the parents still have power over their children of both sexes during adolescence. When they have male adolescent children, parents must find themselves in some conflict between wanting their advice to be generally accepted, and wanting their sons to begin to adopt an appropriate masculine role and act more independently of them. It would be legitimate to assume that the sons themselves are in conflict on the same point, both because of their identification with the parents and because of their "marginality," their temporary double orientation toward adulthood and childhood. According to Parsons (1949b), girls too, have a tendency toward conflict in regard to independence in adolescence. He describes the shock with which the adolescent female discovers that her mother, who has always appeared to have the prominent position in the family, is actually in an inferior position, and is dependent on a male. The discovery that she, too, is going to be dependent on a male, and have to defer decisions to him, may arouse the resentment of the adolescent girl, and this resentment may cause her to adopt behavior which is atypical of the feminine role, particularly if the identification with the parent is weak. It would generally be expected, however, that adequate identification would be related to a need for independence which gradually increases with age for boys, and which either increases less, or does not increase at all for girls.

Lynn (1959) agrees with Parsons (1949b) in emphasizing the adolescent girl's difficulty in accepting the feminine role. He holds that the female has an initial advantage in identification because the early closeness to the mother develops directly

into an appropriate identification for her, whereas the male, with the same initial intimate contact with the mother, has to shift his identification to the father. However, it later appears that the rewards and prestige for the male identification are overwhelming compared to those for the female. At the same time, masculine characteristics are much less punished in females than are feminine characteristics in males. For these reasons, Lynn hypothesizes that the feminine identifications of girls progressively become weaker while the masculine identifications of boys become stronger, and that more girls than boys will adopt characteristics of the other sex role. If the present expectations concerning the utilizability of need for independence as a criterion of identification are valid, this would predict a more stable pattern for boys, with some girls also showing the increases which typify the male pattern.

Identification should also have implications for the strengths of the orientations toward each of the sources of influence. The increasing need for independence would be expected to be accompanied by a decreasing reliance on the influence of the parents for males (although, as has been noted, there is likely to be some internal conflict on this point, both for parents and the sons as well), and an increasing reliance on the impulses and values. Values would be expected to take the largest increase in conjunction with an adequate identification, since they are the standards which come to be the internal representation of the parental influence, while one learns to guard himself against his impulses. By the same token, girls would be expected to reduce their reliance on values and impulses, or at

least not to increase them, and to increase or not reduce their reliance on parents. Girls, preparing for a life of greater dependence, might be also expected to be more reliant on the influence of their peers than are boys.

Many studies have reported differences between social classes in techniques and demands of socialization. These differences, if truly consistent, should produce differences in the power of the various guides. Davis and Havighurst (1952) found middle class parents to be more strict, and to expect their children to be more responsible, achievement oriented, and more ready to frustrate their impulses. Davis (1944) holds that the main differentiations between the two classes are that the middle class has an anxiety-permeated orientation toward achievement which the lower class does not have, and the lower class is much more acceptant of aggression than is the middle class. Ericson (1946) found lower class parents to be more lenient, less exacting, not as frustrating, and not to place as early an emphasis as did middle class parents on the development of responsibility and on individual achievement. Maas (1954), commenting on some of these studies, maintains that while it is correct that lower class children have greater physical freedom and impulsive expressiveness, it is also true that this is accompanied by a greater psychological distance between the lower class child and his parents, and often by parental rejection of the child. Middle class children, while more limited physically, are more open for psychological growth, and have a "more flexible, open system of communication" with the parents. Bronfenbrenner (1958a), reviewing a number of these studies (and

particularly comparing earlier studies with those in the last decade), concludes that differences between the classes in amount and type of punishment are becoming less pronounced in recent years, although the middle class is perhaps still more achievement oriented. In terms of orientations toward sources of influence, these results would lead one to expect greater reliance on parents and values for middle class children, and on peers and impulses for lower class children. The earlier studies would also lead one to expect greater punishment from middle class parents, although the lower class might be more ready to use physical means when punishment was undertaken. The later and earlier studies would agree that middle class children are more reliant on parents and values, but the later would indicate little difference in punishment between the classes.

Consequences of class differences in child-rearing practices for the development of need for independence are not as clearly indicated from these studies. On the one hand, lower class children may be less restricted and more free of control; while on the other, middle class children are expected to develop "responsibility" (a quality which would seem to be related to independence) earlier.

Criteria of Appropriateness

Situations differ in the extent to which the influence of each of the guides is considered appropriate by the individual. The criteria for determining this are learned. Although no specific predictions are made as to what these criteria are, it is

hoped that by ascertaining the relative extent to which each of the guides attempts influence, and the extent to which this influence is accepted in situations of various kinds, some relevant information will be obtained. Differences are expected between the sexes, between age groups, and between classes as well.

CHAPTER II

PROCEDURES, AND VALIDATIONS OF OPERATIONS

Procedures

Design

The data were gathered by means of a checklist inventory and an interview given to the same respondents usually a week or more later. The inventory was given to the respondents in small groups; the interview was given individually. The inventory was designed to measure the power of each of the guides, the coerciveness of the respondent's relationship with his mother, father, and peers, and his need for independence. The interview consisted of a series of decision situations, some concerning actual experiences of the respondents, and some being presented as hypothetical. The respondents reported their decisions and the relevance of each guide for these situations.

Sample

Respondents were selected by means of a four-stage clustered sample drawn from Michigan high school students, grades 10-12. The first stage consisted of Michigan counties, and the same sample of counties utilized by the Survey Research Center in previous national surveys was used for this study. From a Directory giving the number of students in all the

schools in the state for the year of the study (Michigan Education Directory, 1957), a complete listing of high schools in these counties was derived, and the number of students in the three grades was estimated for each school. Twenty-one schools were selected randomly from the list of schools, and a listing of all the home-rooms (or their equivalent) and the number of students in each was obtained for each of the three grades for all the listed schools. Three home-rooms were then randomly selected from the list of home-rooms for each school. In schools where the estimation of the number of pupils in grades 10-12 had been in error, an additional home-room occasionally fell into the sample. This occurred for some schools which had ninth through twelfth grades, and for which the total was given on the basis of these grades. The number of students in grades 10-12 in these schools was extrapolated on the basis of the ratio of these grades to the 9-12th grade total for the entire state the previous year. These extrapolations resulted in several underestimations of the 10-12 grade total, probably because high schools in some areas have disproportionately small ninth grades when junior high schools in the same area include ninth graders. Where this underestimation occurred, an extra class occasionally was selected, to keep the same proportion of representation among the schools in the sample. These errors resulted in the enlarging of the sample from an originally planned 350 to a final total of 375, a total which also reflects the refusal of one school (which was not replaced) and a small number of individual absences. After the home-rooms had been selected, a listing of all of the students in these

home-rooms was obtained, and six students were randomly selected from each home-room. The total of 375 is the number of respondents from whom information was obtained with the inventory; 372 of these were also given the interview.

Operations

The inventory ("Inventory" in Appendix B) contains three sections. The first section is designed to measure the power of each of the guides. Twenty-three endings were constructed for the sentence beginning, "Generally, what my father (or one of the other guides) tells me to do is:" These endings represented different evaluations of the advice of the guide, some of them being "the best to follow," "no fun," "sometimes idiotic," "just the right thing," "very nice," "sometimes wrong," etc. Following each sentence was a seven-point agreement-disagreement scale, with "strongly agree" at one end of the scale, and "strongly disagree" at the other end. The respondent was asked to put a check at the point on the scale which represented his true feelings. The same 23 sentence-endings were used in conjunction with each guide so as to give the scores for the power of each guide maximum comparability. Values of one and seven were assigned respectively to the negative and positive ends of each scale, the checks made by the respondent were scored on this basis, and a total score was obtained for each guide.

The second section of the inventory consists of three checklists for measuring the coerciveness of the individual's relationship with his father, mother, and peers. A sentence

beginning, "If I do something which my mother (or father, or peers) has told me not to do:" was given endings with varying degrees of severity of punishment, such as "she hits or slaps me," "she takes away some privilege," "she yells at me," "she scolds me." The respondent was asked to put a check after each sentence in accordance with the frequency with which that punishment was used with him. The categories of frequency were: "always," "usually," "sometimes," "rarely," and "never." In scoring these, the more severe forms of punishment, as well as the greater frequencies, were given more weight. A single coerciveness total score was obtained for the relationship of the respondent with each of the three guides.

The third section of the inventory (the section called "Preferences Inventory") was intended to measure the individual's need for independence. It is a scale originally developed by Zipf for use in another study (Zipf, 1958), and consists of a series of 15 questions which the respondent answers by putting checks on a nine-point scale, ranging from "not at all" to "extremely." Some of these questions were: "How important is it for you to feel that you can run your life without depending upon people who are older and more experienced than you?" "How much do you like people who are forceful and dominant?" "How much do you usually want the person who is in charge of a group you are in to tell you what to do?" A total score on need for independence was obtained for each individual.

Two types of situations were investigated in the interview, "real" and "hypothetical" (see "Interview Schedule for Decision-Making Study," Appendix B). In the "real" situations,

questions were asked about decisions the respondent had actually made, or was in the process of making; while in the "hypothetical" ones, respondents were asked to imagine themselves in the process of making certain decisions, and questions were asked about these. There were six real situations, and seven hypothetical ones. Among the real situations, questions were asked about decisions with respect to Going Steady, Breaking Off a Friendship, Getting a Job, Joining a Club, Plans Following High School Graduation, and Which Course To Take in High School (out of such alternatives as general, commercial, and college preparatory). One of the hypothetical situations was of a projective type, where the respondent was shown a picture of a boy or girl in thought, and asked to make up a story about a decision this person was trying to make. The conditions in the other hypothetical situations were made more explicit. Here are the other hypothetical situations as they were presented to the respondents:

1. Party-Aunt. Suppose that some of your friends suddenly decide to have a party and ask you to come, on an evening when you had promised your parents you would go with them to visit an aunt, and your aunt expects you. What would you do?

2. Stay-Go. Suppose you are at a friend's house, talking and having a good time with a group of close boy (girl) (same sex as respondent) friends, one evening. It is getting later and later. You know your parents are home, and that they told you to be home by a certain time. Your friends try to persuade you to stay since everyone is having a good time. What do you do?

(The Stay-Go situation was given in two forms; half the respondents were presented the situation as it is here, and the other half were told that their parents were not home, all the other elements of the situation remaining identical. The conditions of the two situations constitute the presence vs. absence of the coercive power holder of hypothesis No. 5.)

3. Copying. Suppose you are taking a test and a classmate of yours whom you know slightly starts copying from your paper. What would you do?

4. Friend's Home. Suppose that you have met a boy (girl) [same sex as respondent] your own age whom you and your friends like very much. You bring him home with you one afternoon. Your parents meet him and seem to take a dislike to him. After he leaves they tell you not to see him again, he is a "bad influence," etc. They seem to feel fairly strongly about this. You see him in school the next day, and he invites you to his house. What do you do?

5. Rumor. Suppose that someone tells you that a person whom you consider as a fairly close friend has been saying bad things about you behind your back. Then, one day you see the friend walking on the street. He (she) [same sex as respondent] smiles and says hello. What do you do?

6. Ask Out. [This situation was also given in two forms, one for boys and one for girls. The problem was made as similar as possible for the two sexes.]

   A. Boys. Imagine that a close friend of yours has told you that he is very interested in a new girl with whom he has already gone out a few times. He introduces you to her one evening and immediately you like her very much. You feel very strongly that you would like to ask her out. A few days later you mention this to your friend. He tells you he would really rather you didn't ask her out. You speak to your parents about it. Your mother feels very strongly that you should ask the girl and let her decide. Your father doesn't have such a strong feeling about the matter. However, he says that the best thing would probably be not to call the girl. Most of your close friends give you approximately the same advice as your father, but they feel it somewhat more strongly. Your conscience tells you without a bit of doubt that you should not call her. You don't want to lose the friendship of your friend, but on the other hand, what if she should turn out to be the "right girl" for you? Which would you do, ask her out or not?

   B. Girls. Imagine that a close friend of yours has told you that she is very interested in a new boy with whom she has already gone out a few times. She introduces you to him one evening and immediately you like him very much. You feel very strongly that you would like to go out with him. A few days later you mention this to your friend. She tells you she would feel badly if he went out with another girl, even you. You meet the boy in a drug store

> once and talk to him for a while. You are sure he likes you too, and you think he is going to call soon. You speak to your parents about it. Your mother feels very strongly that if he asks you, you should go out with him. Your father doesn't have such a strong feeling about the matter. However, he says that the best thing would probably be not to go out with him. Most of your other close friends give you approximately the same advice as your father, but they feel it somewhat more strongly. Your conscience tells you without a bit of doubt that you should not go out with him. You don't want to lose the friendship of your friend, but on the other hand, what if he should turn out to be the "right boy" for you? One evening he calls you up for a date. Do you go out with him or not?

In the real situations, and in the hypothetical Rumor situation, relevance was typically measured by asking questions such as: "Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?" "Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?" (for the relevance of impulses), and "Did your conscience tell you whether one thing was better than another?" (for the relevance of values). In the hypothetical situations (with the exception of Rumor), the questions asked were merely ones such as, "What would your mother want you to do?" "What would you personally just feel like doing?" and "What would your conscience tell you was the right thing to do?" Subjects were here given much less opportunity to respond that the guide had not been relevant. However, this question was always followed up, in the hypothetical situations, by a pair of questions which measured the strength of relevance: "How sure are you of that?" and "How strongly would she feel about it?" Responses to each of these two questions were given on seven-point scales, and multiplied together for the strength of

relevance measure. Although strength of relevance is required by the theory presented here, a measure of it was not obtained in the real situations because it was felt that the real decisions, occurring usually at some time long before the interview, would not be remembered accurately enough to provide valid measures of this variable. The real situations obtain their sensitivity in regard to relevance by the wording of the questions, which allow for responses of non-relevance more readily than is the case for the hypothetical situations. The Rumor situation was presented in the same form as the real situations (with regard to the relevance questions) because it was the least structured of the hypotheticals. It was felt that respondents would not be able to give reliable responses to the strength of relevance questions for this situation because of its lack of structure.

For some of the hypothetical situations, respondents were not asked about the relevance of certain guides. Their relevance in these cases, was constructed into the situation, and presented to the respondent as part of the situation. In the Stay-Go situation, the direction indicated by parents and peers was presented, but not the strength of relevance. The same is true for peers in the Party-Aunt situation. In the Friend's Home situation, the direction and strength of relevance are included for parents. And in the Ask Out situation, the direction and strength was presented for each of the guides. By thus specifying more of some of the situations, the attempt was being made to increase the similarity of the perceptions which the different respondents had of these situations. In cases where relevance

is the same between individuals, the resultant differences could logically be assigned to differences in power (or some other variable). This was only done in some situations, however, because there was no way of knowing whether the relevance, as constructed into situations, was actually accepted in the same way by different respondents, and because the reported differences in relevance between guides and between situations were also of interest. Some of the other hypothetical situations were constructed so that some guides were almost certain to be strongly relevant (parents in Party-Aunt, for instance). However, relevance questions were asked so that the measures reflect the relevance perceived by the respondent.

Following the presentation of the hypothetical situations, the respondent was asked for a decision, before being asked for the relevance of any of the guides. The questions which were used to elicit these decisions can be seen at the ends of these situations, just presented. The same general procedure was followed for the real situations, with the decision being requested before any of the other information. The respondent would be asked, "Have you ever gone steady?" or "Have you ever broken off a friendship?" If the answer was positive, the fact and direction of the decision were then known, and the relevance questions followed. If the answer was negative, the respondent was asked, "Have you ever had to decide whether or not to go steady?" so that cases in which the decisions had been negative could be differentiated from those in which there had been no decision.

A measure of social class was obtained from information

given by the respondents as to the occupation of their fathers. The respondents were divided into two major groups, according to whether their fathers were engaged in a white collar occupation (including professional, technical and kindred workers, self-employed businessmen and artisans, managers and officials, and clerical and sales workers) or a blue collar occupation (including craftsmen and foremen, operatives and kindred workers, laborers, service workers, unskilled workers, protective service workers, and those in the military services). Farmers were also separated out, but since there were only 26 children of farmers, they were not included in the class analyses.

Validity

Power

One major assumption made in connection with this variable is that it is a general internal orientation, relatively stable across situations. Since the measure was taken at only one time, there is no way of determining whether the stability assumption is a valid one. The best way to test this assumption would be to give the same, or a similar measure to the same subjects at several different times.

The degree to which the variable actually represents a measure of power cannot be ascertained with any assurance. The scales which were used were designed with certain specifications in mind. Responses in terms of general orientation were wanted; therefore the sentences were phrased so as not to mention any specific situations. They all referred to advice of a guide, "in general." The attempt was also made to word the sentences

so as to obtain responses of orientations rather than reports of actual behavior. This was done by structuring the responses and sentences toward evaluation. This does not avoid the possibility that respondents will tend to say they think the influence of a given guide is "good" only because they are actually more often influenced by that guide. But it is hoped that the questionnaire phrasing helped to avoid this confounding, and that responses represent the orientations alone. It was assumed that the individual who was predisposed toward accepting the influence of a guide would tend to evaluate the influence of that guide as "good to follow," "wise," etc.

In the last chapter, it was mentioned that the power of the external guides, particularly parents, is the reverse of "need for independence," and that the two should therefore be negatively related. If this is found, it may be considered a partial validation of the power scales. Correlations of -.168 between need for independence and father power, and -.153 between it and mother power are obtained. Both of these are "probably" significant ($p < .05$, with a 40 half-sample variance estimation).[1] However, need for independence also demonstrates correlations of -.139 with impulse power ("possibly" significant; reaching the .05 level, but only with a simple random sampling estimation),[1] -.125 with value power (also "possibly" significant) and -.087 with peer power (non-significant). The power of impulses and values would have been expected to be positively

---

[1]For a discussion of the methods used in ascertaining significance in these and other cases in the present study, as well as the conventions to be used in presenting significance results, see Appendix A.

correlated with need for independence. The general negativity of these relationships may be partially due to the nature of scoring the power scales. That is, there may be a tendency to score high or score low which reduces the independence of measurement of the various guides on the power scales. In fact, the intercorrelations between total scores for the five guides (considering mother and father as separate guides) range from .38 to .60. There is a good deal of variation, which would indicate that the measures are to some degree measuring different things for the different guides, but the variation is in a high range. These substantial intercorrelations in themselves can account for the similar directions of relationship between each of the guides' power and need for independence. The fact that parents have the highest negative correlations with need for independence can be considered evidence for validity, but not strong enough evidence to place great confidence in.

An item analysis was done on the power scales. Each of the 23 items in each scale was correlated with every other item in its own scale, and with the totals of each of the five scales. No clusters of items were found which were consistent from scale to scale. This was the only basis on which items could have been removed since the prime requirement was that the scores on the various scales be comparable. With four exceptions (two in the value scale, and one each in the peer and impulse scales) every item was more highly correlated with the total of its own scale than with the totals of any of the other scales. Most of the correlations between items and their own scale totals were greater than .50.

Relevance

Inasmuch as there were no independent behavioral measures of actual exertion of influence by the various guides, and as the relevance measures were taken in only one way, there is little validity evidence with regard to relevance. The extent to which they fulfill theoretical expectations will be the only indication, although of course a failure to do so cannot be considered clear evidence of nonvalidity, since this could be indicating that the theory is incorrect.

Validity problems are somewhat different between the two measures of relevance. In the real situations, individuals were questioned merely as to whether influence had been exerted, and in what direction. The hypothetical situations assumed some relevance and ascertained the direction with one question, and measured the strength with two additional questions, one about the individual's certainty that the guide's influence would be in the stated direction, and one measuring his perception of the strength of the guide's act of relevance. Although only the second of these questions is specifically related to the strength of the act of relevance, it seemed necessary to include the first in order to emphasize the importance of accuracy to the respondents, and to account for variations in certainty as to the reported influence. Measuring strength of the act without certainty would equate respondents giving accurate and certain statements with those giving uncertain or wishful ones. Multiplying the two scores together made it possible to account for the individual's certainty in his statement, without completely nullifying the strength

reported when the certainty was low.

A source of possible error in the relevance measures recurred in every situation. Since reports as to the actual decisions and as to the directions of influence of each of the guides were given by the same respondents, there is the danger that respondents were rationalizing their decisions to some extent, reporting greater agreement between influences and decisions than actually existed. As the results are presented, it will be seen that there were differences between the decisions and the guides, and between the various guides, in most of the situations. Thus, if a tendency to rationalize is operating, it is being outweighed by forces toward accuracy and objectivity.

In order to ascertain the validity of the assumption that the particular guides on which concentration is centered are actually the most influential for adolescents in general, the interview was started with the projective question described earlier. Guides had not been mentioned or identified up to this point, and were not mentioned during this question. The respondent was asked to tell a story about the decision, ". . . just the first thing that comes to your mind, about what the decision is, what he does to help make up his mind, and what he finally decides." One probe was used to help elicit the identity of important sources of influence: "Why does he decide that?" Table 1 shows the proportion of respondents for whom each of the guides was the first one mentioned in the story. Second mentions are omitted both because they were much less frequent, and because they show the same picture as do the first-mentioned guides.

If the "Other Internal" category is considered to include

TABLE 1

FIRST GUIDE MENTIONED IN PROJECTIVE QUESTION

First Guide Mentioned	N	Proportion of Respondents
Father	16	.04
Mother	16	.04
Parents (neither mentioned individually)	22	.06
Peers	26	.07
Impulses (mentions of "wants" or "desires")	131	.36
Values (mentions of "ought," "should," "what is right")	35	.10
Other Internal (R mentioned "thinking," but did not specify impulse or value)	82	.23
Other External (People other than parents or peers)	23	.06
Nonperson Sources (newspapers, magazines, etc.)	9	.02
NA	4	.01
Total	364	.99

both impulses and values, it can be concluded from Table 1 that the guides on which the study concentrates are actually of most importance to adolescents, at least as evidenced by this projective situation.

Guide Identification

There is little doubt that respondents answered questions which were asked them about "your parents" or "your close friends" in terms of the appropriate guides. Values and

impulses were much more difficult to define and differentiate clearly for the respondents. In the inventory measuring power, impulses were called "personal desires" and defined as "what you, yourself just feel like doing." Values, in the same inventory, were called "conscience," and defined as "what you feel is morally right, what you ought to do."

In order to get an indication as to whether the value and impulse responses were actually referring to values and impulses, an additional pair of questions was added in each of the situations in the interview. After the impulse relevance questions, the respondent was asked, "Why would you (or did you) feel like doing that?" After the value relevance questions, the respondent was asked, "Why would that be (or was that) the right thing to do?" The reasons given in answer to these questions were coded and categorized according to whether they seemed to refer more to values or impulses, as defined in the present study. Table 2 presents the results of this analysis. For each situation, it shows the proportion of respondents who gave impulse responses and of those who gave value responses to the impulse and value reason questions. These proportions are based on the total number of respondents in each situation who gave responses to each question which could be differentiated in this way. At the bottom of the table, composite proportions obtained from the sums of all the impulse and value responses to the two questions are presented. In general, value reasons preponderate on responses to value questions, and impulse reasons to impulse questions. The proportion of value responses is greater than that of impulse responses for two situations in

TABLE 2

PROPORTIONS OF IMPULSE AND VALUE RESPONSES TO IMPULSE AND VALUE QUESTIONS

Situation	Responses to Impulse Reason Questions				Responses to Value Reason Questions			
	N[b]	Impulse Responses		Value Responses	N[b]	Impulse Responses		Value Responses
Plans After High School	247	.68	a	.32	98	.29	a	.71
Party-Aunt	343	.90	a	.10	324	.06	a	.94
Go Steady.	203	.98	a	.02	94	.64	a	.36
Stay-Go.	307	.84	a	.16	260	.18	a	.82
Break Friendship . .	147	.79	a	.21	68	.56		.44
Copying.	325	.26	a	.74	329	.14	a	.86
Get Job.	244	.92	a	.08	103	.40	a	.60
Friend's Home. . . .	325	.57	a	.43	325	.26	a	.74
Join Club.	236	.82	a	.18	78	.46		.54
Rumor	257	.51		.49	222	.30	a	.70
High School Course .	245	.40	a	.60	104	.23	a	.77
Total . . .	2879	.68		.32	2062	.24		.76

[a]"Probable" significant difference between proportions giving impulse and value responses ($p < .05$, with clustering effects accounted for; see Appendix A). The different significance tests, representing at least some of the same respondents, are not independent, although the degree to which one significant finding depends on another is unknown.

[b]Varying N's reflect the fact that all respondents did not answer all questions, and many had not "had to make" each of the real decisions.

the replies to the impulse questions, while for one, Rumor, there is essentially no difference. Value responses predominated in the Copying and High School Course situations. It is possible that the value reasons were so important to the respondents in these particular situations, that although they reported wanting to act in a certain way, these wants were actually motivated by values. All of the differences between the proportions of impulse and value responses to the impulse reason questions were "probably" significant, with the exception of the Rumor situation.

Responses to the value reason questions also show the expected trends, with values preponderating in all but two situations, Go Steady and Break Friendship. Since these are situations which heavily involve strong impulses, the same explanation which was given for the atypical situations in the impulse reason columns may be applied here. In these situations, the impulse reasons, being so central to the situation, may have been believed to be right as well as desirable. In these columns, all differences were "probably" significant with the exception of those for the Break Friendship and Join Club situations. The evidence seems to indicate that the respondents were usually responding to the questions concerning "values" and "impulses" in terms consistent with the present conceptions of these variables.

Coerciveness

In the Friend's Home situation, a question was asked concerning the probable consequences perceived by the respondents if they failed to comply with their parents' wishes. Of

the responses obtained, one, "parents would punish," can be used as a check on the validity of the measure of parental coerciveness. Table 3 presents the proportion of the respondents who gave this response in each of four parental coerciveness groupings. Respondents in these groupings are: those who scored in the upper half of the sample on mother coerciveness, those who scored in the lower half on mother coerciveness, and those in the upper and lower halves of the sample on father coerciveness.

TABLE 3

REPORTED PARENTAL COERCIVENESS AND EXPECTED PUNISHMENT

	N	Low Mother Coercion	High Mother Coercion	N	Low Father Coercion	High Father Coercion
"Parents would Punish"	101	.38	.62	101	.39	.61

The differences between the proportions are "probably" significant for both the mother and father coerciveness groups. Thus the measures of parental coerciveness agree quite strongly with at least one independent measure, related to a specific situation.

Need for Independence

All the items in the need for independence questionnaire were intercorrelated. Zipf, in the original study using these items (Zipf, 1958), had found two clusters, one of which was designated "need for independence." The intercorrelations in the present study produced a slightly different cluster

for this variable. The original need for independence cluster had consisted of items 4,6,7,9,12, and 15 of the "Preferences Inventory" (Appendix B). The new cluster included items 4,5,6, 7,9,11,13 and 14. The new and old need for independence clusters are correlated at .61 in the present data. Zipf's sample was different from the present one. It consisted of 102 self-volunteered college females.

Aside from the expected relationship between parental power and need for independence which has already been mentioned, and whose results may be considered a weak validation of the need for independence measure as well as the power, no independent measures were taken which should similarly reflect the need for independence.

Coding Reliability

The writer check-coded 38 interviews (approximately one out of each ten done by each coder), and compared his results with those of the original coders. Excluding the value and impulse reasons responses, 207 measures were involved in these comparisons, and produced an average proportion of agreement between the two coders of .902. The value and impulse reasons responses had a longer and more complicated code than any of the other measures. Consequently, their inter-coder reliability was only .746.

CHAPTER III

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITUATIONS

The situations used in the interviews were designed without specific characteristics in mind. The intention was to include a broad enough range to sample various types of decisions made by adolescents, and at the same time to pick situations which would be familiar to adolescents, and typical of the kinds of decisions which most of them had to make.

Impulse and Value Reasons

Since much of the data will be shown to vary somewhat from situation to situation, it may be helpful to examine first some information which reflects the respondents' perceptions of the situations. From this, the attempt will be made to derive some rough categorizations of the situations, and group together the ones which appear most similar.

In the section on "Validity" in Chapter II, questions asked the respondents following their responses to the Impulse and Value relevance questions were discussed. The respondents were asked, "Why did you (or would you) feel like doing that?" and, "Why was that (or would that be) the right thing to do?" To use the responses to these questions as a validity check, each one was classified as being reasonably close to the present conception of impulses or values. For the present purposes,

specific responses given in each situation will be examined. In Table 24 (Appendix B) the most frequent responses given in each situation to the impulse and value reasons questions are presented. All responses to each of these questions which were given by 10 per cent or more of the respondents who "had to make" the real decisions, and by 10 per cent or more of the respondents who were asked to decide in the hypothetical situations, are presented.

It will be noted that in several instances value responses were given to impulse questions, and impulse responses to value questions. One example is the "fun" response under the value column in the Going Steady situation. Others are "finding out truth" under the impulse column for the Rumor situation, and the several values mentioned under the impulse column in the Copying situation. Apparently, some respondents gave reasons in answer to both questions which primarily reflected what they considered to be the most salient aspects of the situations; i.e., impulses in the Going Steady situation, values in the Rumor and Copying situations.

There are clearly differences between the situations, in the reasons given most frequently. Twenty-two different reasons emerge as being mentioned relatively frequently in one or more situations. These twenty-two reasons were roughly grouped into the following six categories:

General Values

Keep on the moral path, avoid evil, bad ways, etc.
Keeping one's promises.
Finding out truth, not acting on unverified evidence.
Honesty.
Cheating is bad for the cheater.
People should learn for themselves, not depend on others.

Peer-related Values

One should help others.
One should not interfere with others.

Family-related Values

It is right, proper, to follow advice of parents.
It is wise to follow advice of parents.
Concern for parents' feelings, welfare.
One should live up to parents' trust.
One should meet family obligations.

General Gratifications

Fun, like it, exciting, want to.
Making money (or working) because need or want it.

Peer-related Gratifications

Desire to be with friends.
Desire to make friends, keep friends, act friendly.
Desire to keep groups compatible.
Avoidance of being tied down, restricted to one boy- or girl-friend.

Security

To be better prepared for future.
Self-protection against bad reputation, spread of rumor, etc.
Desire not to be exploited.

In Table 4, an X is placed under a general category, for a situation, when one or more of the reasons in that category were given by more than 10 per cent of the respondents.

These categories comprise the major types of values and impulses which the respondents perceive as being potentially gratified or fulfilled in each of the various situations. They represent at least some of the elements characteristic of the situations.

The external guides, parents and peers, are represented here only as they are reflected in specific values and impulses. The fact that peers seem to appear mainly in connection with

TABLE 4

GENERAL REASONS CATEGORIES, BY SITUATION

Situations	General Values	Peer-Related Values	Family-Related Values	General Gratifications	Peer-Related Gratifications	Security
After High School				X		X
High School Course				X		X
Joining Club				X	X	
Getting Job				X		
Going Steady				X	X	
Breaking Friendship	X			X		X
Rumor	X				X	X
Copying	X	X				X
Friend's Home	X		X	X	X	
Stay-Go			X	X		
Party-Aunt	X		X	X	X	

potential impulse gratification, and that parents appear exclusively in connection with value fulfillment is interesting, but not surprising. Although the only category in which parents are represented, that of Family-related Values, appears in only three of the situations in Table 4, this should not be taken to mean that only in these situations should their influence have any importance. For the reasons mentioned refer to direct consequences of the possible decision alternatives. When parental influence is central to a situation, when following or not following their advice are in themselves decision alternatives whose consequences must be considered, values which relate to that advice become salient. The situations in which the Family-related values are mentioned are those hypothetical situations which were constructed to involve parental influence centrally; Friend's Home, Party-Aunt, and Stay-Go.

The impulse and value categories which relate to peers, on the other hand, are not concerned with the advice of peers. But at least one of the alternatives, in each of the situations in which these categories occur, refers to some kind of interaction with peers. The alternatives would mean being with peers (In Joining Club, Friend's Home and Party-Aunt), would affect the relative number of peers one would spend one's time with (in the Going Steady situation, where the only reason mentioned which related to peers was the avoidance of being tied down to one boy- or girl-friend), and would entail helping and believing a peer (in the Copying and Rumor situations). One situation where the peers were not specifically mentioned, though it was deliberately constructed so as to involve them, was the Stay-Go

situation. Yet the General Gratifications category does occur in this situation, as well as most of the others. This is a rather broad and vague category, representing almost exclusively the reason, "Fun, like it, etc." It is doubtful whether respondents who said that they would want to go to a party because they would have "fun" had a very different reason in mind from those who said that they would want to go because they liked being with their friends.

In general, the gratification categories are widely represented throughout the situations. Only the Copying situation does not include any of them. Values, however, seem mainly to be clearly involved in the hypothetical situations. With the exception of the Breaking Friendship situation (where value reasons were frequently given for not keeping "bad company") the real situations which were chosen apparently did not tap clear moral values. This conclusion is somewhat confused by the Security category, which is perhaps relevant to both impulses and values. The security reason which is represented in the After High School and High School Course situations is "To be better prepared for the future." There is not enough information to determine whether this preparation is considered morally right, is desired in order to ensure future gratifications, or both.

Guide Agreements and Conflicts

The situations can also be characterized according to the percentage of agreement or disagreement which exists in each case between the advice produced by various sources of influence. In Table 5, the percentage of agreements between each pair of

TABLE 5

PER CENT AGREEMENT BETWEEN ALL PAIRS OF GUIDES[a]

Guide-Pairs		Real Situations				Hypothetical Situations				Row Mean
		Get Job	Go Steady	Break Off	Join Club	Party-Aunt	Stay-Go	Copy-ing	Friend's Home	
Father-Mother	%	82	83	98	95	90		97		93
	N	64	48	39	100	227		287		765
Father-Peer	%	90	54	92	94	08		58		49
	N	82	46	25	91	261		246		751
Father-Impulse	%	87	55	84	94	17		75		62
	N	172	70	37	113	257		286		935
Father-Value	%	96	70	94	98	92		97		93
	N	99	63	34	61	254		290		801
Mother-Peer	%	88	54	86	93	12		60		52
	N	92	35	43	114	291		275		850
Mother-Impulse	%	88	66	85	91	22		74		65
	N	191	72	68	137	287		322		1077
Mother-Value	%	97	79	90	97	88		95		92
	N	107	56	67	72	287		322		911
Parent-Peer	%						b		22	22
	N								286	286
Parent-Impulse	%						19		19	19
	N						362		327	689

"Parents" used together

"Parents" used together

TABLE 5--Continued

Guide Pairs		Real Situations				Hypothetical Situations				Row Mean
		Get Job	Go Steady	Break Off	Join Club	Party-Aunt	Stay-Go	Copy-ing	Friend's Home	
Parent-Value	%						95		81	88
	N						357		315	672
Peer-Impulse	%	88	74	85	98	90	81	68	78	82
	N	102	97	78	169	338	361	287	283	1715
Peer-Value	%	88	78	82	88	04	05	58	40	35
	N	61	58	64	85	334	356	285	273	1516
Impulse-Value	%	82	86	82	90	14	24	72	39	50
	N	131	128	136	111	332	354	340	304	1836
Column mean	%	89	72	86	94	42	45	76	46	63
	N	1101	673	591	1053	2868	1790	2940	1788	12804

[a]Only situations which presented two distinct alternatives are used. N's are based on totals of cases in which both guides exerted influence in a definite direction. Cases in which the R did not "have to make" the decision are omitted, as well as all cases where one or both guides was nonrelevant.

[b]The direction of influence for parents and peers was constructed into the Stay-Go situation; hence their agreement also.

guides is presented for eight of the situations investigated. Only those situations were used, in this analysis, which presented two clearly opposed alternatives. The Ns for each pair of guides in each situation consists of all those cases in which both guides were reported to produce relevant influence. It will be noted that the Ns are much smaller for the real situations than they are for the hypotheticals. There are two reasons for this; many respondents had not made each of the real decisions and thus were not questioned about them, and more respondents in the real situations than in the hypotheticals reported guides to have been nonrelevant, to have produced no influence. As has been mentioned, this was probably largely due to the different wording of the relevance questions for the two types of situations.

Perhaps the most striking difference in this table is that between the hypothetical and the real situations. There is a high level of agreement between all of the guides in most of the real situations. In the hypothetical situations, however, some of the pairs of guides have consistently low percentages of agreement. This difference does not exist for all the pairs of guides. Father and mother are in as high agreement with each other, and with values, in the hypothetical situations as in the reals. The same is true for peers and impulses. But between parents and values on one side, and peers and impulses on the other, consistent conflict appears in the hypothetical but not the real situations. This difference may occur for one or both of the following reasons. It is possible that respondents reporting the real situations find it more necessary to

rationalize and defend; that the conflicts either were not perceived when the situation occurred, or they are not remembered. The hypothetical situations however, being removed from reality, are projective to a degree. Here conflicts can more easily be recognized and expressed. Although this is a plausible explanation, there is not sufficient independent evidence in this study to either confirm or deny it. Another possible explanation is more straightforward. According to this, the differences in percentage of agreement for certain guide-pairs between the hypothetical and real situations represent actual differences in the amount of conflict existing between these guides in these particular situations. The hypothetical situations were usually designed to maximize the conflicts. The real situations could not be so structured, and it may be that the one's chosen simply did not have these conflicts.

There is one exception to the trends noted for each of the groups of situations. Among the real situations, Go Steady has low agreement relative to that which is found in the other real situations, between father and peers, father and impulses, and mother and peers. This may be a situation which, being more unique to adolescence than most of the other real situations, and perhaps having fairly specific peer-developed standards, seems more legitimate for conflict with parents to adolescents. Among the hypotheticals, Copying shows no low percentages of agreement relative to the other hypotheticals (there are no percentages of agreement below 50 per cent). It was expected that peer standards would be opposed to internalized parental values in the Copying situation, and although the

lowest percentages of agreement between guide pairs in this situation occur between peers and father, peers and mother, and peers and values, they still represent a good bit more agreement than do the conflicts which are to be found in the other hypothetical situations.

To summarize the results of this table: among the hypothetical situations, strong conflict is found between parents (considered separately or together) and peers, parents and impulses, peers and values, and impulses and values for the Friend's Home, Party-Aunt and Stay-Go situations (excluding the parent-peer conflict in the latter, for both are given relevance in the situation as presented). The Copying situation shows moderate conflict between peers and parents and between peers and values. No other conflicts occur in the hypothetical situations. Among the real situations, moderate conflict occurs between father and peers, father and impulses, and mother and peers in the Going Steady situation, but in no others.

For those of the situations which involve value-impulse conflicts, some information as to the nature of these conflicts can be obtained by returning to Table 24 (Appendix B) and examining the particular values and impulses most frequently mentioned in these situations. Table 5 showed strong value-impulse conflict in three situations, Friend's Home, Party-Aunt, and Stay-Go, and mild value-impulse conflict in the Copying situation. Impulses most involved in the Friend's Home situation were "fun, etc." and "desire to be with friends." These are opposed by values on following parental advice. (Although one other value appears frequently in this situation, it appears

under the impulse column not, in this case, because impulses and values were confused but because it constituted a reason in agreement with the preponderant direction advocated by impulses. This value was "finding out truth," i.e., finding out if the forbidden friend is really as bad as the parents say.) The Stay-Go situation involved "fun, etc." against values on parental advice, feelings, and trust. The Party-Aunt situation posed "fun, etc." and "desire to be with friends" against values on meeting family obligations, keeping promises and following parental advice.

Relevance Structure

Percentage of Relevance

From the present theoretical point of view, an important characteristic of the decision situation is the relative relevance of the various guides. It is one of the variables used to predict the decision. However, as it shall be seen, great differences in the amount of relevance between guides and (for most guides) between situations occur. Attempting to understand the reasons for these differences may help to delineate more clearly the nature of the particular decisions involved.

It was said that the individual's perceived appropriateness of a given guide's influence in a given situation is related to the guide's relevance, particularly for internal guides. Although no direct measure of appropriateness was made, the measures of <u>percentage</u> of relevance presented in Table 6 can be considered in part to reflect perceived appropriateness for the reasons which follow.

TABLE 6

PER CENT RELEVANT BY SITUATION AND SEX

Real Situations		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
		Boys	Girls	Total[d]	Boys	Girls	Total[d]
After High School	%	68[b]	54	60	63	61	62
	N	137	175	312	136	176	312
High School Course	%	55	59	57	51[c]	68	61
	N	109	145	254	110	148	258
Joining Club	%	59[c]	37	46	61	56	58
	N	98	130	228	98	131	229
Getting Job	%	75	68	71	77	78	78
	N	130	117	247	128	120	248
Going Steady	%	18[b]	33	27	22[c]	44	36
	N	79	127	206	80	126	206
Breaking Friendship	%	17	23	20	17[c]	49	35
	N	88	113	201	89	117	206
Hypothetical Situations							
Rumor	%	24	28	26	24[c]	76	52
	N	135	169	304	135	168	303
Copying	%	86	91	89	93	94	94
	N	145	191	336	150	207	357
Party-Aunt	%	83	83	83	89	84	86
	N	139	187	326	150	206	356
Stay-Go	%	a			a		
	N						
Friend's Home	%	a			a		
	N						

[a]Direction of relevance was constructed into the situations for these guides. The Ask-Out item is omitted because the relevance of all five guides was built into the situation.

[b]"Possible" significant difference ($p < .05$) between male and female, by simple random sample estimation (see Appendix A).

[c]"Probable" significant difference ($p < .05$) between male and female, with clustering accounted for (see Appendix A). The different significance tests are not independent, but the degree to which one significant finding depends on another is unknown.

TABLE 6--Continued

Peer Relevance			Impulse Relevance			Value Relevance		
Boys	Girls	Total[d]	Boys	Girls	Total[d]	Boys	Girls	Total[d]
46 138	49 176	48 314	88 131	84 172	86 303	42 137	43 175	42 312
27 110	35 144	31 254	88 102	89 148	89 250	42 107	44 142	43 249
76 96	65 132	70 228	99 95	95 133	96 228	40 95	46 132	44 227
34[b] 129	49 125	41 254	92 129	93 125	93 254	53 129	50 125	51 254
38 81	40 130	39 211	96 81	91 130	93 211	51 81	64 130	59 211
31[c] 89	49 119	41 208	89 88	89 119	89 207	57[c] 89	77 118	69 207
48[c] 126	64 167	57 293	91 129	88 171	89 300	78 130	85 170	82 300
79 151	82 212	81 363	99 153	98 213	98 366	97 153	99 211	98 364
a			100 151	99 208	99 359	98 150	99 208	99 358
a			99 154	99 212	99 366	99 152	99 211	99 363
86 146	94 201	91 347	99 149	99 205	99 354	97 148	99 211	98 359

[d]N's differ between situations and between guides as some respondents did not answer questions concerning some situations, and some did not respond to particular relevance questions within a situation.

If direct observation of the influence process had been used in this study (rather than respondent's reports of that process) an indication of perceived appropriateness could be the relative degree to which the deciding individual sought out the advice of the various guides. In itself this would not be a very accurate measure since an individual could decide not to consult a guide for other reasons than the guide's inappropriateness. The measures which were used do not differentiate influence sought out by the individual from that given him or forced upon him without his requesting or desiring it. Yet it seems reasonable to suppose that over a large number of individuals, those who exert the most influence are those who are the most appropriate; "illegitimate" influence attempts would be expected to occur only in a minority of cases. Further, since the measures of relevance are based on respondents' recollections in the real situations, and on their imaginations in the hypothetical, the appropriateness which they perceive could influence the relevance which they report, particularly in the hypothetical situations where there is no constraint to report accurately an actual occurrence. As indicated earlier, this problem only exists for the external guides. The internal guides are appropriate when they are activated. To the extent that a report as to the relevance of an external guide, based on an individual's memory or imagination, takes on some of the internal characteristics (where the individual in effect is the only one who determines whether the guide should be called into play), relevance could be expected to reflect perceived appropriateness accurately.

Table 6 presents the percentage of reported acts of relevance for each guide in each situation. Totals are based on these, the relevant responses, plus the non-relevant, the cases where the guide did not give a clear direction, or was not consulted. This measure is called "percentage of relevance," since it reflects the relative frequency with which a guide exerts influence. It differs from "strength of relevance" in that the former refers only to the fact that influence is exerted, while the latter refers to the strength with which that influence is exerted.

It has already been pointed out that guides were reported to have a higher percentage of relevance in the hypothetical situations than in the reals, because the questions which elicited the relevance responses were worded differently (with the exception of the Rumor situation), and because these situations were purposely designed to have these guides influential.[1]

Impulses can be seen to be the dominant guide in nearly every situation. In order to test this apparent dominance, a Friedman test (as described in Siegel, 1956) was done on the situations which had relevance scores for all five guides, using ranks obtained by comparing the total relevance percentages of the five guides within each situation. This test showed a significance level of $p < .01$, indicating a significant departure from randomness in the ranking across situations. The same

---

[1]No measure of relevance percentage could be taken for guides whose advocated direction was built into a situation. These guides were 100 per cent relevant by definition of the situation. It could be taken, however, in those instances in which relevance was not specifically given to the respondent.

test was repeated omitting impulses from the ranking, but using the other four guides. With these guides, the test did not show significant consistent ranking. Impulses are the only guide which clearly predominates across situations, according to this test. Apparently impulses constitute a usually present influence for adolescents.

Relevance for the totals in the real situations (plus Rumor) ranges from .20 to .96 per cent, a range of 76 points. To aid the characterization of the situations, this range is arbitrarily divided into three areas, with percentages of 20-45 representing "low" relevance, percentages of 46-70 representing "moderate" relevance, and percentages of 71-96 representing "high" relevance. Impulses are "high" in each of the real situations. The other guides show more variation. The After High School and Joining Club situations are characterized by "moderate" parents and peers and "low" values; the High School Course situation by "moderate" parents and "low" peers and values; the Getting Job situation by "high" parents, "low" peers and "moderate" values; the Going Steady and Breaking Friendship situations by "low" parents and peers and "moderate" values; and the Rumor situation by "low" father, "moderate" mother and peers, and "high" values. The hypothetical situations (except for Rumor) present a much more restricted range. Parents and peers are generally less relevant in them than impulses and values, however.

Parents have high relevance among the reals only in the Getting Job situation, perhaps because they could be most expected to have expert knowledge in this one. Parents have low

relevance in the two situations concerned with intimate personal relationships, Going Steady and Breaking Friendship. Peers are never highly relevant, but they are moderate (just missing the "high" category) in the Joining Club situation, the real situation which most involves interaction with peers as a decision alternative. They are also moderate in the After High School situation; perhaps comparison of one's own plans with peer's plans is used as a means of making this decision. The Rumor situation, which involves a peer, and which has been seen to involve peer-related gratifications (Table 4), also shows peers to be moderately relevant. Values reach the "high" category only in the Rumor situation. It has already been shown (in Table 24) that this situation involved general values more than any other did. The fact that impulses are generally high in relevance is also in agreement with the impression given by Table 24, in which frequent impulse reasons occurred in nearly every situation.

Differing relevance scores indicate that the situations are perceived somewhat differently in some cases by boys and girls. Of the 11 significant differences between percentages for boys and girls (shown by bs and cs in Table 6), nine of them show greater relevance for girls. Boys have significantly more relevant fathers in the After High School and Joining Club situations than do girls. It is conceivable that in the former situation boys consider their fathers to have expert knowledge of the adult male post-high-school role. Yet by this token, girls should have more relevant mothers than do boys, and they do not. There is a slight preponderance (nonsignificant) in

relevance of fathers over mothers for boys, and another (also nonsignificant) of mothers over fathers for girls in this situation. These lend some slight support to this interpretation. For girls, this is part of a general pattern. They have more relevant mothers than fathers in every situation. This difference is "probably" significant in the Joining Club, Breaking Friendship and Rumor situations. No such consistency between mother and father relevance occurs for boys.

A reason for the male-female discrepancy in father relevance for the Joining Club situation is not apparent. Girls have more relevant mothers than do boys in the High School Course situation. This may be part of a greater control which mothers feel it necessary to maintain over daughters than sons in certain situations, and which is manifested in the fact that girls have more relevant mothers than do boys in the Going Steady, Breaking Friendship, and Rumor situations. The latter three situations clearly involve matters of conduct affecting reputation which are presumably potentially more damaging for girls than boys, and for which the mother would be expected to be more ready to give admonishments to girls than boys on that account. The High School Course situation, however, does not involve reputation, or anything for which protective maternal control would seem particularly helpful.

Girls have significantly more relevant peers than do boys in three situations, Getting Job, Breaking Friendship, and Rumor. It is doubtful whether a single reason can explain these three discrepancies. If it is true that girls are more concerned about the possible effect of the latter two of these situations

on their reputations (and Table 24 shows that more girls than boys mentioned the protecting reputation reason for these situations), it seems plausible to think that they would be more inclined to get the opinions of their peers, since the peer group is probably the focal point for setting standards for, and determining "reputation." The Getting Job situation does not refer to reputation, but also has a somewhat different meaning for boys than it does for girls. It is less common for adolescent girls to get jobs than it is for adolescent boys. Seventeen per cent of the boys had never had a job, as compared to 38 per cent of the females (a "probably" significant difference). Perhaps girls talk to their peers more in order to help clarify and structure what is for them a relatively unusual situation.

Values are more relevant for girls than boys in the Breaking Friendship situation. Although the greater concern for girls about reputation would seem to be a likely explanation for this discrepancy also, one would expect the same male-female discrepancy to occur in the other reputation-relevant situations, but though in these there are fairly sizable differences in the correct direction (nearly reaching significance in the Going Steady situation), they do not reach statistical significance.

One other set of relationships in this table is of interest. Considering just the real situations (plus Rumor), it will be noted that parents are relatively highly relevant in the first four situations and relatively less relevant in the next three situations. Values, on the contrary, have low

relevance in the first four situations and high relevance in the next three. If it is assumed that values are mainly internalized from parents, it is not inconsistent to suppose that each would exert their major influence in different situations. In situations where the influence of parents predominate, it is possible that the appropriate values have not yet been sufficiently internalized, while in those situations where the necessary guiding values are a part of the deciding individual, the parental guidance (whose role has been taken over by the individual's values) may not be required. Looking at the parent-value differences for boys and girls separately, it can be seen that boys' fathers are "probably" significantly greater in relevance than their values for these situations: After High School, Joining Club and Getting Job. The difference is in the same direction, but misses significance for girls in the After High School situation, and is in the opposite direction, though not significantly so, in the Joining Club situation. Mother shows greater percentages of relevance than do values for both boys and girls for each of the same four situations. This predominance is significant for both boys and girls in the After High School and Getting Job situations, is significant for boys but not girls in Joining Club, and for girls but not boys in the High School Course situation (all "probable" significant differences). In the next three situations in Table 6, Going Steady, Breaking Friendship, and Rumor, values are "probably" significantly greater than both mother and father in every instance but one, girls' mothers in Rumor, where the difference is in the same direction, but too small for significance. The

evidence is not consistent enough to provide striking support for the generalization, but the trends are clearly in that direction. Parents seem more likely to exert influence when values do not, and values to do so when parents do not.

Strength of Relevance

It will be remembered that in the hypothetical situations, a measure of strength of relevance was obtained by asking the respondent how certain he was that a guide would indicate the direction he had said it would, and how strongly the guide would want him to act in the indicated direction. These questions could be asked only after the respondent had stated that the guide would exert influence in a given direction. If a guide was reported not to indicate a direction, his strength of relevance was automatically zero, and the two questions would have been redundant or meaningless. A guide which indicated a direction, however, could do so with any amount of strength. Responses to the two questions were given on two seven-point scales; the strength of relevance measure is the product of the two. The following table presents means for the strengths of relevance of each guide for which the measure was taken in the hypothetical situations. Those guides for which both direction and strength of relevance were presented to the respondent as part of the situation are necessarily omitted.

It was noted, in the examination of the table showing percentages of relevance, that impulses was generally the predominant guide. The same does not seem to be the case for the measure of strength of relevance. Here, although impulses are still consistently high, they are usually not the guide with

the greatest strength of relevance in a given situation. It should be noted at this point that the strengths of relevance of parents and peers in the Stay-Go situation and peers in Party-Aunt, are partly due to an artifact. For these guides, the direction but not the strength of relevance was constructed into the situation. Therefore the certainty component of strength of relevance was not obtained by questioning the respondents for these guides, but was assigned to every one as seven.[1] The strength of relevance measure was then computed by multiplying the responses to the "strength" question (which could range from one to seven) by seven. But even if these guides are omitted from the examination, impulses are still the strongest guide in only one of the four situations, Party-Aunt. They are significantly weaker in relevance than values in the Stay-Go and Copying situations (see Appendix A for a discussion of the estimation of significance levels for differences between means). The present data plus those in Table 6 seem to be indicating that while impulses represent an influence which must always be considered (having a high percentage of relevance in every situation), they do not usually exert their influence with the most strength of relevance, and thus their demands can perhaps be resisted despite their ubiquitousness. More evidence relevant to this speculation will be seen when data showing the

[1]This was done for the following reason: the certainty question measured the respondent's confidence in his statement that a guide would indicate a given direction. But when the respondent was told, as part of the situation, that the guide indicated a given direction, he could have no doubt about it. His certainty on this point should then be absolute, and a score of 7 (the highest possible certainty) seemed justified.

TABLE 7

MEAN STRENGTH OF RELEVANCE BY SEX FOR FOUR HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS

Situation		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
		Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]
Copying	$\bar{X}$	34.4	36.7	35.7	37.9	37.4	37.6
	N	138	177	315	138	177	315
Party-Aunt	$\bar{X}$	25.3	25.0	25.1	29.6	27.3	28.3
	N	138	177	315	138	177	315

		Parent Relevance		
		Boys	Girls	Total
Stay-Go	$\bar{X}$	42.0	42.9	42.5[c]
	N	138	177	315
Friend's Home	$\bar{X}$			[c]
	N			

[a]N's are reduced in this table because the sample was restricted to those respondents who answered questions concerning each of the guides in each of these situations for reasons of computational efficiency.

[b]Significant difference between males and females ($p < .05$ with clustering accounted for, or $p < .01$ by simple random sample estimation; see Appendix A). Different significance tests are not independent, though the degree to which one influences another is unknown.

[c]For peers in the Party-Aunt situation, and for parents and peers in the Stay-Go situation, the direction of relevance was built into the situation, but not the strength. Respondents were not asked the "certainty" question for these guides, but their response to the "strength" question was multiplied by an assigned certainty of seven in these situations (the direction having been told them, it was assumed that the respondents' certainty would be absolute concerning that direction). Parents in the Friend's Home situation were presented to the respondents with both direction and strength of relevance.

TABLE 7--Continued

Peer Relevance			Impulse Relevance			Value Relevance		
Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]
24.1 138	26.9 177	25.7 315	35.2[b] 138	38.7 177	37.1 315	37.8 138	40.6 177	39.4 315
40.4[b] 138	42.5 177	41.5[c] 315	35.5 138	35.7 177	35.7 315	33.0[b] 138	37.4 177	35.5 315
41.9 138	43.0 177	42.5[c] 315	35.5 138	36.3 177	36.0 315	36.6[c] 138	41.7 177	39.5 315
25.8 138	29.0 177	27.6 315	35.0 138	36.2 177	35.7 315	34.3 138	37.8 177	36.2 315

influence of the relevance of the guides on the decisions is presented.

Another pattern which was seen in the relevance percentages for the real situation fails to appear when the strengths of relevance are examined. This is the balancing phenomenon noted between parents and values, where one was high in percentage of relevance when the other was low. In the two situations in which both parents and values appear in Table 7 (excluding Stay-Go because of the artifact mentioned), values are significantly higher than both parents in each instance. Yet only the Party-Aunt situation seems to fit the requirements of the balancing hypothesis, where parents are quite low and values quite high. The Copying situation, while it shows a significant difference, shows it between two guides both of which are high, relative to the other scores which appear in the table. If this does represent a disconfirmation of the previous finding, it may be that while the balancing holds for the relative frequency with which parents and values exert influence in a situation, it does not hold for the amount of strength behind the influence when it is exerted. Yet, since the balancing phenomenon did not occur for the percentage of relevance measures in the hypothetical situations, the fact that it did not work for them in the strength of relevance measures either is perhaps not contradictory. Of course the hypothetical situations made responses of nonrelevance more difficult and less frequent, and for this reason there was not enough variation in the percentage of relevance measures to show the balancing even if it were there. Perhaps it would have shown up if the

questions were phrased as they were for the real situations. But nothing can be based on such a speculation. It is equally likely that the situations were different beyond merely the phrasing of the questions, and that the phenomenon only occurs in certain types of situations (the hypotheticals and reals were seen to be different, for example, in the amount of conflict between certain guides). And perhaps strength of relevance, if it had been measured in the real situations, would also have shown the balancing phenomenon there.

Turning to the male-female differences in Table 7, it can be seen that girls have stronger values in all four of these hypothetical situations (significantly so for two of the situations, while the other two approach significance). Whether these results would generalize to other types of situations is not known, but as Tables 24 and 4 have shown, at least three general types of values seem to be involved in these four situations, a finding which would seem to be in favor of regarding these situations as having a fair degree of generality, at least as far as values are concerned. Girls also have significantly stronger impulses in the Copying situation, and significantly stronger peers in the Party-Aunt situation. Differences in the same direction occur between boys and girls for peers in the other three situations in Table 7 also, but only in this one is it significant. While the same is true of impulses, the differences are much smaller; only the one which reaches significance being sizable. It is possible that the latter two significant differences reflect underlying patterns; but for the present they must remain isolated and unexplained.

Effect of Social Class on Relevance

It has been seen that some of the situations appear to have different meanings to boys and girls. As the following two tables will show, the individual's social class also produces, in some instances, an effect on the relevance structure of the decision situation. In Table 8, the percentage of relevance scores are presented for the real situations (plus Rumor) by class and sex. Only the strength of relevance scores are presented for the four hypothetical situations in Table 9, for the small amount of variation which these situations allowed in percentage of relevance is not adequate to help characterize them according to the respondents' perceptions of structure.

Bronfenbrenner, in a recent review (1958a) re-analyzing data from social-class child-rearing practices studies over a period of twenty-five years, shows that differences in techniques between the classes seem to be becoming less pronounced in recent years. The same white-collar--blue-collar break which is used in the present study was used by Bronfenbrenner for this analysis. Thus, where Davis and Havighurst (1952) found greater physical freedom and impulsiveness for the lower class, and greater parental control and more strict parental expectations for middle class children, studies in the last decade have found middle class parents to be generally somewhat more permissive, though still having more exacting achievement goals for their children.

To the extent that the present relevance measures are accurate indices of the actual behavior of the guides (and not excessively subjectively distorted), they will reflect the

TABLE 8

PER CENT OF RELEVANCE BY CLASS, SEX, AND SITUATION

Situation	Class		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]
After High School	White Collar	%	74	66	70	68	70	69
		N	62	61	123	62	60	122
	Blue Collar	%	63[b]	47[c]	53[e]	58	57	57
		N	75	114	189	74	116	190
High School Course	White Collar	%	67	65	66	53[c]	78	65
		N	54	48	102	55	50	105
	Blue Collar	%	49	57	54	49	63	58
		N	55	97	152	55	98	153
Joining Club	White Collar	%	58[b]	36	47	63	53	58
		N	43	47	90	43	47	90
	Blue Collar	%	60	37	46	60	57	58
		N	55	83	138	55	84	139
Getting Job	White Collar	%	78	72	76	77	90	82
		N	60	36	96	61	39	100
	Blue Collar	%	71	65	68	78	73	75
		N	70	81	151	67	81	148
Going Steady	White Collar	%	26	37	32	27[c]	60	45
		N	31	41	72	33	40	73
	Blue Collar	%	12[c]	31	25	19	37[d]	31
		N	48	86	134	47	86	133
Breaking Friendship	White Collar	%	16	17	16	18[c]	50	34
		N	38	36	74	39	40	79
	Blue Collar	%	18	26	23	16[c]	48	35
		N	50	77	127	50	77	127
Rumor	White Collar	%	31	38	34	35[c]	84	58
		N	62	56	118[d]	63	56	119
	Blue Collar	%	18	24	22	14[c][e]	71	50
		N	73	113	186	72	112	184

[a]N's are reduced because children of farmers were not included; other variations reflect the different numbers of respondents who answered different questions.

[b]"Possible" significant difference between boys' and girls' relevance percentages ($p < .05$ by simple random sample estimation; see Appendix A).

[c]"Probable" significant difference between boys' and girls' relevance percentages ($p < .05$ with clustering accounted for; see Appendix A).

TABLE 8--Continued

Peer Relevance			Impulse Relevance			Value Relevance		
Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]
51	51	51	90	84	87	47	43	45
63	61	124	59	61	120	62	60	122
41	49	46	86	85	85	37	43	41
75	115	190	72	111	183	75	115	190
29	32	30	88	94	91	38	51	45
55	50	105	50	51	101	52	49	101
25	36	32	88	87	87	45	40	42
55	94	149	52	97	149	55	93	148
70	69	70	98	96	97	38	49	44
43	49	92	42	49	91	42	49	91
81[b]	63	70	100	94	96	41	45	43
53	83	136	53	84	137	53	83	136
41	52	46	90	90	90	54	45	50
61	40	101	61	40	101	61	40	101
28[b]	47	39	94	94	94	51	52	52
68	85	153	68	85	153	68	85	153
36	34	35	97	93	95	58	76	68
33	41	74	33	41	74	33	41	74
40	43	42	96	90	92	46	58	54
48	89	137	48	89	137	48	89	137
36	50	43	90	90	90	64	85	74
39	40	79	39	40	79	39	39	78
28[b]	48	40	88	89	88	52[b]	73	65
50	79	129	49	79	128	50	79	129
53	70	61	87	90	88	76	90	83
60	56	116	61	59	120	63	58	121
45	61	55	94	88	90	79	83	82
66	111	177	68	112	180	67	112	179

[d]"Possible" significant difference between white and blue collar ($p < .05$ by simple random sample estimation; see Appendix A).

[e]"Probable" significant difference between white and blue collar ($p < .05$ with clustering accounted for; see Appendix A). The various tests of significance are not independent, but the extent to which one depends on another is not known.

amount of control which the guide attempts to exert. Table 8 shows a few significant differences between white and blue collar respondents, but by no means a general and consistent trend. There are significant white collar preponderances in father relevance for boys and girls taken together (with clustering accounted for) and for females separately (with the simple random sample estimation) in the After High School situation. A difference in the same direction exists between white and blue-collar males, but it does not reach significance. Perhaps a white-collar father, having reached a culturally defined higher status in the occupational hierarchy, perceives himself and is considered by his children to be more of an expert on occupational and educational matters than is his blue-collar counterpart. White-collar mothers are "possibly" significantly more relevant for girls than are blue-collar mothers in the Going Steady situation. This was mentioned as a situation where mothers would feel that their daughters needed protective guidance more than their sons. The difference between the sexes exists for both class groups, though it does not quite reach significance for the blue-collar respondents. But white-collar mothers evidently feel a much greater need to guide their daughters correctly in this situation than do blue-collar mothers. This is not because blue-collar girls are more ready to be guided by their own values in this situation. White-collar girls show nearly significantly more relevant values than do blue-collar girls for this situation. Perhaps it is a situation which does not appear to blue-collar mothers to be as anxiety-laden and potentially dangerous for their

daughters as it does to white collar mothers.

The other situation which shows significant class differences is Rumor. White-collar boys and girls combined (but not separately) report significantly greater father relevance in the Rumor situation (with the simple random sample estimation) than do blue-collar. White-collar boys have significantly more relevant mothers than do blue-collar boys in the same situation (with clustering accounted for). The difference for females' mothers nearly reaches significance also. This situation also involves protection, and it is consistent with the previous finding that white-collar parents seem to show more concern about this.

These findings indicate that if white-collar parents manifest more control over their children, it is primarily in those situations which involve their protection. The father is also more consulted by white-collar respondents in one situation of another type in this table, After High School. Although the white-collar father may be seen as having more expert knowledge for this situation, the same knowledge might seem to apply for the Getting Job situation, where there is no such difference between classes. But this latter situation refers to temporary jobs which were taken on during the respondent's high school tenure. A white-collar parent would be no more in a position to give expert advice in this situation than a blue-collar parent.

Differences between boys and girls show generally the same pattern that was seen in Table 6. However, some of the differences are significant only within one of the two class

groups. Usually the group which does not show the significance does have a fairly sizable difference in the same direction. One notable difference which shows up in this table is that between blue-collar boys and girls for peer relevance in the Joining Club situation. Table 6 showed no significance in the difference between boys and girls for this guide in this situation. And the two sexes show equal relevance for peers in the white-collar grouping. Peers show about the same relevance for girls in the two class groupings, while blue-collar boys show a fairly large but nonsignificant relevance preponderance over white-collar boys. Some information as to the meaning of these differences can be gained by looking at the types of clubs joined by the respondent groups. The types of clubs which were mentioned can be divided into two categories: achievement, including national activity clubs such as Boy Scouts, Future Teachers of America, school honor clubs, and church clubs; and social, including fraternities, sororities, youth clubs, etc. Of the white-collar boys who could be coded into one or the other of these categories (n = 35), 04 per cent said that their decision had concerned a social type of club. This compares with 20 per cent of the blue-collar boys (n = 41), 14 per cent of the white-collar girls (n = 43), and 17 per cent of the blue-collar girls (n = 72). Although the difference is not significant, due to the small n's, blue-collar boys seem to find this a situation much more purely social than do white-collar boys (although all groups fall predominantly in the achievement category). For blue-collar boys, perhaps the middle-class oriented achievement ethic

provides less motivated involvement, the goals of this achievement being less obtainable for them. But this does not explain the difference between blue-collar boys and girls. Blue-collar girls join social clubs as much as blue-collar boys do, but have less relevant peers. The writer is unable to explain this fact.

All of the significant differences between classes in Table 9, which shows the mean strength of relevance scores for four hypothetical situations, occur in the Copying situation. White-collar respondents say that their parents would have stronger opinions concerning copying than do blue-collar respondents. (Although this difference does not reach significance for girls for either father or mother strength of relevance, they show differences in the same direction, and therefore contribute to the differences in the totals, which are significant.) This is the one situation in this table where parents are not clearly and specifically involved. It is also the situation which, as has been seen in Table 24, most involves abstract moral values. White collar respondents have parents more strongly concerned with inculcating these values; perhaps their children are more likely to consider the moral attitudes of their parents in their absence for this reason.

Male-female differences follow the same general pattern as in Table 7. Two facts here however, present some additional information. Whereas there was no significant difference between boys and girls for parent relevance in the Stay-Go situation in Table 7, here there is a significant difference between blue-collar boys and girls, parents having stronger relevance

TABLE 9

MEAN STRENGTH OF RELEVANCE BY CLASS, SEX, AND SITUATION

Situation	Class		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]
Copying	White Collar	$\bar{X}$	38.4	38.0	38.2	41.1	38.6	39.9
		N	63	61	124	63	61	124
			d		d	d		d
	Blue Collar	$\bar{X}$	31.1	35.9	34.0	35.2	36.7	36.1
		N	75	116	191	75	116	191
Party-Aunt	White Collar	$\bar{X}$	27.6	26.3	26.9	29.5	26.2	27.9
		N	63	61	124	63	61	124
	Blue Collar	$\bar{X}$	23.4	24.3	23.9	29.6	27.8	28.5
		N	75	116	191	75	116	191

			Parent Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total
Stay-Go	White Collar	$\bar{X}$	42.9	41.2	42.1[b]
		N	63	61	124
	Blue Collar	$\bar{X}$	41.2[c]	43.9	42.8[b]
		N	75	116	191
Friend's Home	White Collar	$\bar{X}$			[b]
		N			
	Blue Collar	$\bar{X}$			[b]
		N			

[a]N's are reduced by the exclusion of the children of farmers.

[b]For peers in the Party-Aunt situation, and for parents and peers in the Stay-Go situation, the direction of relevance was built into the situation, but not the strength. Respondents were not asked the "certainty" question for these guides, but their response to the "strength" question was multiplied by an assigned certainty of seven in these situations. Parents in the Friend's Home situation were presented to the respondents with both direction and strength of relevance.

[c]Significant difference between males and females (see Appendix A).

[d]Significant difference between white collar and blue collar (see Appendix A). The different tests are not independent, and the degree to which one affects another is not known..

TABLE 9--Continued

Peer Relevance			Impulse Relevance			Value Relevance		
Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]	Boys	Girls	Total[a]
24.2 63	29.9 61	27.0 124	34.5[c] 63	39.6 61	37.0 124	39.4 63	41.6 61	40.5 124
24.1 75	25.4 116	24.9 191	35.8 75	38.1 116	37.2 191	36.5[c] 75	40.1 116	38.7 191
41.0 63	41.2 61	41.1[b] 124	36.7 63	33.5 61	35.2 124	32.7[c] 63	37.4 61	35.0 124
39.8[c] 75	43.0 116	41.8[b] 191	34.4 75	36.8 116	35.9 191	33.2[c] 75	37.3 116	35.7 191
42.5 63	43.5 61	43.0[b] 124	35.3 63	34.2 61	34.8 124	37.1[c] 63	42.3 61	39.7 124
41.3 75	42.7 116	42.1[b] 191	35.6 75	37.5 116	36.7 191	36.3[c] 75	41.3 116	39.3 191
26.2 63	28.9 61	27.5 124	35.0 63	36.4 61	35.7 124	33.4[c] 63	38.3 61	35.8 124
25.4 75	29.0 116	27.6 191	34.9 75	36.1 116	35.7 191	34.9 75	37.5 116	36.5 191

for the girls. This is consistent with the greater parental concern in matters of conduct over girls than boys which was postulated earlier, but it is not clear why it should occur for the blue-collar but not the white-collar group in this situation.

The other discrepancy from the earlier pattern occurs in the Party-Aunt situation, where the male-female difference in strength of peer relevance which reached significance in Table 7, can here be seen to be produced almost entirely by the blue-collar respondents; the girls again being predominant. The writer has no explanation for this difference.

Summary

Table 10 summarizes the results in this chapter which seem most distinctive and useful in characterizing the situations; the over-all relevance percentages for the real situations plus Rumor, the mean strength of relevance scores for the hypothetical situations, excluding Rumor, and the most frequently mentioned impulses and values. Although certain other effects were found within social class and sex subgroups, they were not strong enough to effect changes in the general structure of the situation in most instances. The picture which is presented in the table is substantially the same for the subgroups as well. As was mentioned earlier, it is somewhat doubtful whether responses in the security category are actually consistent with the present conception of values. This doubt is strengthened by the fact that in the two situations in which the security category was mentioned

TABLE 10

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE SITUATIONS

Situation	Father Relevance*	Mother Relevance*	Peer Relevance*
After High School	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
High School Course	Moderate	Moderate	Low
Joining Club	Moderate	Moderate	Moderate
Getting Job	High	High	Low
Going Steady	Low	Low	Low
Breaking Friendship	Low	Low	Low
Rumor	Low	Moderate	Moderate
Copying	Moderate	High	Low
Party-Aunt	Low	Low	High
	Parent Relevance		
Stay-Go	High		High
Friend's Home			Low

*Relevance categories are derived from the range of percentages of relevance of the guides for the real situations, plus Rumor. The last four hypothetical situations present relevance categories derived from upper, middle, and lower thirds of the obtained strength of relevance mean scores in these situations. These means are high partially due to an artifact for peers in Party-Aunt and Stay-Go, and for parents in Stay-Go. This does not affect the cutting points for the range of strength of relevance means since some other guides were equally high.

TABLE 10--Continued

Impulse Relevance*	Type of Impulses Involved	Value Relevance*	Type of Values Involved
High	General	Low	Security
High	General	Low	Security
High	General, and Peer-related	Low	
High	General	Moderate	
High	General, and Peer-related	Moderate	
High	General	Moderate	General, and Security
High	Peer-related	High	General, and Security
High		High	General, Peer-related and Security
Moderate	General, and Peer-related	Moderate	General, and Family-related
Moderate	General	High	Family-related
Moderate	General, and Peer-related	Moderate	General, and Family-related

alone under the value column (After High School and High School Course), the percentage of value relevance is in the low third.

Other data presented in this chapter indicated that the hypothetical situations generally manifested conflict between the influence produced by parents and values on the one hand, and peers and impulses on the other, while there was generally little conflict in the real situations; that girls generally have more relevant mothers than fathers, while neither parent is dominant in relevance for boys; that mothers have more relevance for girls than boys in situations involving control for protection, and that this is more true for the white-collar group; that there seems to be some tendency for values and parents to balance each other out, so that in situations where one is more frequently relevant the other is less frequently relevant; and that girls have more strongly relevant values than do boys in the hypothetical situations.

CHAPTER IV

ASSOCIATION OF POWER, NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE, AND PARENTAL COERCIVENESS WITH RELEVANCE

Power and Relevance

In order to determine whether power and relevance were independent of each other, their association was investigated for those situations used in the analysis which utilizes their interaction (Chapter VI).

Table 11 presents the percentage of relevance for each guide in four real situations by two power groupings; "low" consisting of respondents who scored in the lower half of the sample on power for that guide, and "high" consisting of those who scored in the upper half. Table 12 presents the mean strength of relevance scores for the guides in four hypothetical situations, compared across the same power groupings as in Table 11.

In Table 11, 17 out of 20 discrepancies which occur show greater relevance for the high power grouping. However, there are only two cases where this difference reaches statistical significance, mother and peer relevance in the Get Job situation. There are also three more cases where the difference approaches significance; mother relevance in Going Steady and Breaking Friendship, and value relevance in Breaking Friendship.

TABLE 11

PER CENT OF GUIDE RELEVANCE BY POWER GROUPING FOR FOUR REAL SITUATIONS

Situation	Power[a]		Father Relevance	Mother Relevance	Peer Relevance	Impulse Relevance	Value Relevance
Join Club	High	%	49	59	74	96	43
		N[b]	134	138	141	137	149
	Low	%	43	57	67	95	46
		N[b]	116	122	129	133	120
Get Job	High	%	72	87	49	94	52
		N[b]	135	137	145	144	143
	Low	%	64	69[c]	32[c]	92	48
		N[b]	141	148	151	152	153
Going Steady	High	%	29	40	44	91	62
		N[b]	109	119	124	126	125
	Low	%	22	30	35	94	53
		N[b]	122	119	127	125	126
Breaking Friendship	High	%	21	43	44	88	75
		N[b]	104	115	124	126	117
	Low	%	18	33	38	89	62
		N[b]	121	123	121	118	127

[a]For each relevance column, the high and low power groupings refer to the power scores for the guide represented in that column, so that father relevance is grouped according to high and low father power, peer relevance according to high and low peer power, and so on.

[b]N's vary between situations and between guides because some respondents did not answer questions pertaining to each situation and to each guide within a situation. Also, no power scores were obtained for absent parents.

[c]"Probable" significant difference between percentages for high and low power grouping ($p < .05$ with clustering accounted for; see Appendix A for a discussion of the estimation of significance).

The results for the mean strength of relevance scores in Table 12 are much the same. Here all 18 differences show greater relevance for the high power grouping, though some of them are very small. There are four differences which are significant and interestingly enough these significant differences occur only between the value power groupings, and occur for them in each of the hypothetical situations represented in the table. The only other fairly large differences in Table 12 are found for father and mother relevance in the Copying situation.

Although the differences effected by the power groupings on relevance would be too weak to state that a definite association existed if it had been hypothesized, they are perhaps also too strong to state that there is no relationship. Most of the data in these two tables indicate a faint, but fairly consistent trend for power to be associated with relevance.

Theoretically, one would expect these two variables to be independent of each other for the external guides, if the relevance measures were actually reflecting guide behavior, rather than the subjective, wishful distortions of that behavior which have been indicated to be a possibility. The power scores represent internal orientations on the part of the individual which are assumed to underlie his readiness to accept influence from the guide. Since the orientation is internal, it cannot directly influence the behavior of external guides (of which relevance is one form). But there may be a more indirect relationship between the two variables. French and Snyder (1959) found that leaders attempted to exert more influence when they were accepted (liked) by the group members.

TABLE 12

MEAN STRENGTH OF RELEVANCE SCORES BY POWER GROUPINGS FOR FOUR HYPOTHETICAL SITUATIONS

Situation	Power[a]		Father Relevance	Mother Relevance	Peer Relevance	Impulse Relevance	Value Relevance
Copying	High	$\bar{X}$	37.2	39.7	26.1	37.6	42.0
		N[b]	176	181	189	189	188
	Low	$\bar{X}$	33.9	36.7	25.4	36.3	36.9[c]
		N[b]	170	175	180	180	181
Party-Aunt	High	$\bar{X}$	25.2	28.8	41.7	36.0	37.8
		N[b]	176	181	189	189	188
	Low	$\bar{X}$	24.6	28.0	41.2	34.7	32.8[c]
		N[b]	170	175	180	180	181
Stay-Go	High	$\bar{X}$	42.7[d]	42.7[d]	42.6	36.8	41.7
		N[b]	176	181	189	189	188
	Low	$\bar{X}$	42.4[d]	42.4[d]	42.5	35.9	37.6[c]
		N[b]	170	175	180	180	181
Friend's Home	High	$\bar{X}$	e	e	28.0	35.8	38.6
		N			189	189	188
	Low	$\bar{X}$	e	e	27.3	35.6	33.7[c]
		N			180	180	181

[a]For each relevance column, the high and low power groupings refer to the power scores for the guide represented in that column, so that father relevance is grouped according to high and low father power, etc.

[b]N's are reduced for father and mother because no power scores were obtained for absent parents.

[c]Significant difference between means for high and low power groupings ($p < .01$ by simple random sample estimation; see Appendix A).

[d]Relevance scores were obtained for "parents" in this situation, rather than

for father and mother separately. However, since the power scores were taken for each parent alone, the parent relevance mean scores for the high and low father power groupings are presented under the father relevance column, and the parent relevance mean scores for the high and low mother power groupings under the mother relevance column.

[e]Both direction and strength of relevance were constructed into this situation for the parents.

This was explained as due to an increase in the influencers' perceived probability of success. Applying this to the present case, it might be assumed that the power holder perceives in some way that the individual is strongly oriented toward accepting his influence, and therefore exerts influence, expecting that it will be accepted.

It is also possible that the relationship between power and relevance moves in the other direction. The power of a guide may be a product of a long series of interactions; an individual may develop a strong orientation toward a guide which has consistently been highly relevant. Since it has been suggested that previous experiences of relevance are partial determinants of relevance in a given situation, this would indicate a possible connection between present relevance and power of a guide.

But there is no evidence in the present study which indicates that either of these explanations should be favored. In light of the material which there is, the following seems to be the most parsimonious explanation: the respondents show a slight tendency to color their relevance responses according to their orientations toward accepting the influence of a given guide. This tendency is usually almost completely counterbalanced or outweighed by a striving for accuracy.

A relationship between power and relevance would be expected to be more direct for the internal guides. Relevance for these guides originates from an internal source; the individual himself perhaps can call them into play. Then the fact that the individual has some control over their relevance

could allow him to influence this relevance directly in accordance with the strength of his orientations toward these guides. In Tables 11 and 12, there are no significant differences in percentage of relevance between the power groupings for the internal guides, significant differences in strength of relevance between each pair of value power groupings, and no significant differences in strength of relevance for the impulse power groupings. The values in Table 12 show such strong and consistent differences that it does not seem possible that this could be a fortuitous result. Yet clearly the relevance of internal guides in all other instances in these tables do not show themselves to be strongly controlled by their power. Taking these data at face value, one can conclude that: (1) Though there is a tendency, power of the internal guides does not determine the fact of relevance for these guides, i.e., it has little influence on the choice of whether or not they shall be called into play. (2) The strength of relevance produced by values is strongly and consistently related to value power. (3) The strength of relevance produced by impulses is largely unrelated to impulse power.

The two internal guides do not behave in the same way. The fact that impulse relevance is relatively unrelated to impulse power (with both the percentage and strength of relevance measures) gives impulses a point of similarity to the external guides. Values show a different relationship between these variables than do any of the other guides. Exactly to what this difference should be attributed is not immediately evident. Perhaps the individual has more control over his values

than any of the other guides (including impulses), values being consciously held while impulses originate partially in the unconscious (and thus may be activated against the individual's will), and external guides produce influence which originates outside the individual's life space, and can be independent of the individual's desires. But the difference only exists for the relationship between power and strength of relevance. If the individual does have more control over the exertion of influence of his values, it is over the strength of relevance, but not the frequency with which influence is exerted. It may be that the individual with strong value power actually has stronger individual values than does one with weak value power. Perhaps the stronger orientation underlying greater power adds an increment of strength to each individual value, and is enabled to do this because of the individual's control over his values. Or, it may be that for some reason the respondents simply failed to differentiate between the power and strength of relevance questions for values, while they were able to for each of the other guides. This does not seem very likely, however, for if the differentiation were not made, one would think it would not be made for all the guides. The better explanation seems to be that individuals are to some extent more able to control their values, and use this control to manipulate value strength of relevance in accordance with value power.

Need for Independence and Relevance

In Chapter I, it was stated that the need for independence is conceptually the reverse of parental power. In Chapter

II, significant but small negative correlations between the two were presented, indicating that although the relationship is in the expected direction, a great deal of the variance is left unaccounted for. Accordingly, the relationship between need for independence and parental relevance will be compared with that between parental power and parental relevance. These results are presented in Table 13 for each of the situations which measured relevance percentages for each of the parents. High and low need for independence categories are based on upper and lower halves of the range of need for independence scores for each of the groups for whom relevance measures are presented; males, females, and the total sample responding to a given decision situation.

Only a few of the differences within situations between high and low need for independence groupings reach significance. However there is a consistent trend, particularly under the father relevance columns, for low need for independence to be associated with greater relevance. Every difference in the father relevance percentages, for boys, for girls, and for the totals, is in this direction. The same trend appears under the mother relevance columns, but not as consistently; there are a few reversals. For a rough judgment of the significance of these consistencies, a Wilcoxon Matched-Pairs Signed Ranks test (as described in Siegel, 1956) was done for each column of relevance percentages, considering the two need for independence groupings in each situation as a matched pair. Since the measures in different situations are not independent, the low and high need for independence groupings being composed of

TABLE 13

PER CENT OF PARENTAL RELEVANCE BY NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE AND SEX

Situation	Need for Independence[a]		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total[b]	Boys	Girls	Total[b]
After High School	High	%	67	43	54	63	56	60
		N	88	94	182	92	103	195
	Low	%	69	[c] 62	[d] 65	63	69	67
		N	58	100	158	62	109	171
High School Course	High	%	58	56	57	59	67	64
		N	69	79	148	73	86	159
	Low	%	63	64	64	44	76	64
		N	49	77	126	50	86	136
Get Job	High	%	68	49	59	76	70	73
		N	87	70	157	87	70	157
	Low	%	73	64	67	73	85	80
		N	55	85	140	55	85	140
Join Club	High	%	53	28	39	58	59	58
		N	66	82	148	66	82	148
	Low	%	63	38	47	57	56	56
		N	41	81	122	42	81	123
Going Steady	High	%	08	22	17	18	41	31
		N	50	76	126	51	76	127
	Low	%	[c] 29	32	[d] 31	29	41	37
		N	42	82	124	41	83	124
Breaking Friendship	High	%	17	16	16	15	47	32
		N	60	68	128	60	68	128
	Low	%	18	21	20	24	52	44
		N	38	80	118	37	80	117
Rumor	High	%	23	25	24	27	63	46
		N	84	89	173	90	101	191
	Low	%	27	32	30	20	75	55
		N	60	96	156	59	101	160
Copying	High	%	79	81	80	91	96	94
		N	89	102	191	88	101	189
	Low	%	87	82	84	92	90	91
		N	60	108	168	61	108	169

TABLE 13--Continued

Situation	Need for Independence[a]		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total[b]	Boys	Girls	Total[b]
Party-Aunt	High	%	76	74	74	88	82	85
		N	83	99	182	84	101	185
	Low	%	83	75	78	90	80	84
		N	58	104	162	58	102	160

[a]Low and high need for independence groupings are based respectively on the lower and upper halves of the need for independence score range for each of the groups represented in the relevance columns, males, females, and the total.

[b]Varying N's reflect different numbers of respondents answering these relevance questions in the various situations.

[c]"Probable" significant difference between percentages for low and high need for independence grouping ($p < .05$ with clustering accounted for; see Appendix A). The different significance tests are not independent, though the degree to which they influence one another is not known.

[d]"Possible" significant difference between percentages for low and high need for independence grouping ($p < .05$ by simple random sample estimation; see Appendix A).

approximately the same respondents for each situation, these tests should not be considered reliable demonstrations that the trends exist, but perhaps only strong indications. The Wilcoxon test showed the percentage of father relevance to be significantly greater across situations for the low need for independence grouping for boys, girls, and the totals ($p < .01$ in each case). The same test did not show significance in the differences for mother relevance, although significance at the .05 level was approached in the tests for girls and for the totals (these two groups of course were not independent).

The differences which occurred in parental relevance for the two power groupings were similarly consistently in the direction of greater relevance for the high power grouping

(Tables 11 and 12), although the number of situations in these tables was too small to use a Wilcoxon test. The assumption that parental power and need for independence are the reverse of each other (Chapter I) is somewhat strengthened by the fact that the two variables have approximately the reverse relation to relevance; weak but consistent.

Need for independence seems to be related to father relevance both for boys and girls. It shows no relation to mother relevance for boys, but a trend in that direction for girls. Independence perhaps primarily means independence from the father's influence for both boys and girls, with mother somewhat involved for girls as well. Two types of determinants of these relevance scores may both be related to the need for independence. The need for independence may develop more strongly when the parent habitually offers little advice, forcing the child to become more exclusively dependent on his own resources (if need for independence can be assumed to be directly related to actual independence). Or the child who has a need for independence may be less willing to request advice from his parents, particularly, apparently, from his father. We cannot differentiate these two types of relevance, but it seems likely that both processes may exist, cyclically reinforcing one another; non-directive parents producing a need for independence in their children who then become less likely to request advice from their parents.

Parental Coerciveness and Relevance

Coercive power is based on an orientation toward accepting the influence of an external guide because of the

TABLE 14

PER CENT OF PARENTAL RELEVANCE BY PARENTAL COERCIVENESS AND SEX

Situation	Parental Coerciveness[a]		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total[b]	Boys	Girls	Total[b]
After High School	High	%	70	53	61	61	68	65
		N	88	91	179	72	100	172
	Low	%	64	52	57	65	58	61
		N	58	103	161	82	112	194
High School Course	High	%	62	61	61	56	72	67
		N	71	74	145	61	85	146
	Low	%	57	59	58	50	71	62
		N	47	82	129	62	87	149
Get Job	High	%	76	58	69	79	75	77
		N	84	60	144	70	83	153
	Low	%	60	56	58	71	82	76
		N	58	95	153	72	72	144
Join Club	High	%	61	29	44	63	56	59
		N	64	70	134	54	87	141
	Low	%	51	37	41	52	58	55
		N	43	93	136	54	76	130
Going Steady	High	%	20	32	27	30	46	40
		N	51	62	113	46	78	124
	Low	%	15	24	21	15	36	28
		N	41	96	137	46	81	127
Breaking Friendship	High	%	19	24	21	24	51	40
		N	58	55	113	49	77	126
	Low	%	15	16	16	12	49	34
		N	40	93	133	48	71	119
Rumor	High	%	28	28	28	22	69	50
		N	87	85	172	74	108	182
	Low	%	19	29	25	27	69	50
		N	57	100	157	75	94	169
Copying	High	%	85	90	88	96	94	95
		N	87	90	177	73	109	182
				c	c			

TABLE 14--Continued

Situation	Parental Coerciveness[a]		Father Relevance			Mother Relevance		
			Boys	Girls	Total[b]	Boys	Girls	Total[b]
Copying	Low	%	77	76	76	88	91	89
		N	62	120	182	86	100	176
Party-Aunt	High	%	81	83	82	97	83	89
		N	85	87	172	72	103	175
				c	c	c		c
	Low	%	75	67	70	80	79	79
		N	56	116	172	70	100	170

[a]Low and high parental coerciveness groupings are based respectively on the lower and upper halves of the appropriate parental coerciveness score range for each of the groups represented in the relevance columns; males, females, and the total. Coerciveness groupings are taken from the father coerciveness scores for the comparisons made under the father relevance columns, and from the mother coerciveness scores for the comparisons made under the mother relevance columns.

[b]N's reflect the fact that some respondents had absent parents, that some did not respond to each situation, and that some did not respond to each relevance question.

[c]"Probable" significant difference ($p < .05$ with clustering accounted for; see Appendix A) between relevance percentages for low and high parental coerciveness groupings.

potential, perceived in him, for mediating punishments. The measure of this type of power, consisting of reports of the respondents as to the frequency and severity of punishment from each parent, implicitly assumed that power develops out of a history of specific instances of relevance, and that therefore respondents would be likely to perceive parents who had been generally punishing in the past to be potential punishers in the present. If parents are more punishing because they are trying to keep their children under closer and more rigid control, this greater coerciveness may be associated with the exertion of more influence attempts by the parents over the

behavior and decisions of their children, or, in the terms of the present study, a greater percentage of relevance.

Table 14 presents the percentage of relevance, in each of the situations in which the measure was taken, for both parents by high and low coerciveness groupings. The father relevance columns present percentages based on father coerciveness groupings, and the mother relevance columns, percentages based on mother coerciveness groupings.

As in the previous table, few of the differences within individual situations reach significance, although the differences seem consistently to be in the same direction. The Wilcoxon test was done for the data on this table, again considering the two groupings in a situation to be a matched pair. It showed father relevance to be significantly greater for the high father coerciveness grouping than for the low father coerciveness grouping for boys and for the totals[1] at the .01 level, while females, though showing most differences in the same direction, just missed significance at the .05 level. The differences between mother relevance for the high and low mother coerciveness groupings also reached significance at the .01 level for males and the totals;[1] females here missed significance completely.

Highly coercive parents exert influence on more occasions than do less coercive parents then, primarily for boys. It is possible that girls are more likely than boys to consider relatively strong coercion from the parents to be illegitimate, and therefore not to report more relevance when

[1]These are not independent of each other.

the parents are more coercive.

Summary

Power shows a slight but consistent tendency to be associated with relevance. This is true both for percentage of relevance and strength of relevance. Power is strongly related to the strength of relevance of values.

Need for independence manifests a slight but consistent negative relationship with father relevance for both boys and girls, a somewhat less consistent one with mother relevance for girls, and no trend at all with boys' mother relevance.

Parental coerciveness relates positively to parental relevance quite consistently for boys. Girls show the same trend with father, but not mother coerciveness.

CHAPTER V

SOME DETERMINANTS AND CORRELATES OF POWER

Power being one of the two variables utilized to predict the decision in the present study, results showing the relationship between power and certain other variables (some of them already discussed in terms of their association with relevance) will be examined in this chapter.

Power Means Over-all, by Sex and by Grade

Table 15 presents mean power, need for independence, and coerciveness scores by each of the three grades sampled in this study and by sex. With the exception of mother and father, each of the power means from the over-all totals is significantly different (see Appendix A) from every other one. The relative ordering of the guides in terms of their power scores is essentially the same for the subgroups represented in this table, with mother highest, followed by father, values, impulses, and peers in that order. It is interesting to note that this ordering is different from that typically found with the relevance scores. There were differences in the relevance of some guides from situation to situation, but impulses were nearly always highest in percentage of relevance. Yet in power, only peers are lower than impulses. Consistent ordering was not found across the real situations among the other

TABLE 15

MEAN POWER, COERCION AND NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE BY SEX AND GRADE

Sex	Grade	N	Father Power	Mother Power	Peer Power	Impulse Power	Value Power
Male	10	54	124.6 (51)*	126.7	96.4	104.6	113.5
	11	59	125.4 (57)	128.7	96.9	107.8	119.9
	12	40	121.5 (39)	121.3	98.2	103.0	121.5
Male Total . .		153	124.1 (147)	126.0	97.1	105.4	118.0
Female	10	81	124.8 (76)	130.3 (80)	104.3	103.0	125.0
	11	68	129.6 (63)	133.8 (66)	108.2	112.1	128.3
	12	66	131.8 (59)	131.8	110.6	115.1	127.1
Female Total .		215	128.4 (198)	131.9 (212)	107.5	112.4	126.7
10th gr. Total		135	124.7 (127)	128.8 (134)	101.1	108.1	120.4
11th gr. Total		127	127.6 (120)	131.4 (125)	103.0	110.1	124.4
12th gr. Total		106	127.7 (98)	127.8	105.9	110.6	125.0
Over-all Total		368	126.6 (345)	129.4 (365)	103.1	109.5	123.1

*Reduced N's, shown in parentheses, are due to cases in which the respondent was living with only one parent, and therefore gave no power or coercion for the absent parent.

TABLE 15--Continued

Father Coercion	Mother Coercion	Peer Coercion	Need for Independence
26.3 (51)	24.0	18.1	40.6
25.2 (57)	21.5	16.6	38.2
22.5 (39)	19.7	15.0	39.4
24.8 (147)	21.9	16.7	39.1
22.7 (76)	24.6 (80)	13.7	37.6
18.7 (63)	21.1 (66)	11.9	37.2
19.1 (59)	20.6	13.5	35.9
20.3 (198)	22.2 (212)	13.1	37.0
24.2 (127)	24.3 (134)	15.5	38.8
21.8 (120)	21.3 (125)	14.1	37.5
20.4 (98)	20.2	14.1	37.2
22.3 (345)	22.1 (365)	14.6	37.9

guides in percentages of relevance. Strength of relevance scores in the hypothetical situations showed impulses and values to be generally high and peers and parents, moderate. Values seem to be the only guide which does not change relative position from the relevance measures to the power measures. In keeping with this, it will be remembered that values were the only guide to show strength of relevance to be strongly and consistently related to power (Table 12). The possibility was mentioned that values may be the only guide over whose relevance the individual has some control, so that the fact that he is strongly oriented toward its influence can actually affect the exertion of that influence. It was also suggested that respondents may not differentiate between the power and strength of relevance of their values. The facts under present consideration are consistent with either of these speculations.

The ordering shown among the mean power scores for the various guides seems in agreement with the notion that the orientations on which power is based represent learned and internalized values (as suggested in Chapter I). Observation of the over-all means reveals that there are essentially two clusters, with parents and values high and fairly similar to one another in strength, while peers and impulses are relatively low in power and similar to one another. This certainly seems to jibe with what one would expect in terms of culturally instilled evaluations of the influence to be generally obtained from these sources from the standpoint of propriety and "rightness." Parents are the major source of the child's values, among which are those enjoining respect for parental advice.

Values give "proper" influence by definition. And peers and impulses, perhaps, tend to be viewed as more on the side of pure and unconsidered gratification, and produce influence to which the individual learns to give a relatively low moral evaluation.

Girls show greater mean power scores than do boys for each guide. These differences are significant between the totals for boys and girls for each guide but father (although for 12th graders the difference becomes significant for father as well). This is somewhat puzzling. If propriety and gratification were the dimensions underlying the power of the guides, it would have been supposed that a female preponderance for the guides strong on one dimension would be balanced by a male preponderance for the guides strong on the other. Girls may tend to be generally more receptive to influence, whatever its source, because of certain characteristics of the role which they fill as adolescents and of the role which they are preparing to fill as women. Girls typically prepare for a very different adult role than do boys, one centered primarily around the home and family as compared to one in which occupational performance is perhaps the most significant and distinctive characteristic. That future roles are actually perceived in this way is attested to by some of the results obtained with the projective question which was used to start the interview. It will be remembered that the respondent, for this question, was asked to tell a story about a boy or girl making a decision. Twenty-two per cent of the boys (n = 153) stated the problem area to be Future Occupation, School, and

Marriage Plans, compared to 16 per cent of the girls (n = 215); while 5 per cent of the boys named Social Problems with the Opposite Sex, compared with 19 per cent of the girls (a "probably" significant difference). Thirteen per cent of the males mentioned Immediate School Problems, as compared with 8 per cent of the females. Unfortunately the code used in this study did not separate future school and work from marriage, but the preponderance of girls in the present Social Problems category, and of boys in the present School Problems category make it seem likely that the "future" category consists mainly of school and occupational plans for males and mainly of marriage plans for females, these being the present categories most oriented, respectively, to future roles centrally occupational and centrally domestic in nature. Girls are preparing for roles of competition for a husband, and later, dependence upon a husband.

Competition would not seem to be a factor making for reliance on one's peers. However if adolescence is viewed as a stage in part preparatory for this competition, conflict with the present peer group is in no way implied. In fact, it is probably primarily from the peer group that standards and criteria for the various elements of attractiveness which will prove to be the crucial manipulanda involved in the competition are learned. Peers are less centrally involved with the attainment of future goals for males, except in that males must compete with other males to get into good schools, get good jobs, etc. But this competition is based on criteria determined by adults rather than peers themselves. Therefore,

the influence of other peers is not directly relevant to the preparation for this competition. This may partially explain the fact that girls have stronger orientations toward the influence of their peers than do boys. An additional factor may be that girls have the relatively weak and unsatisfying sex role identifications postulated by Parsons (1949b) and Lynn (1959). They may become dependent on their peers in order to clarify and bolster this identification. It is relevant to note that peers have more power for older than for younger girls (though the difference between 10th and 12th grade peer power does not reach significance), while boys show no difference with age. Perhaps as girls approach the period in which they will be placed on their own resources, they temporarily increase their reassuring dependence upon one another in order to feel more certain of their competence and endowments for the future roles. Boys, on the other hand, have more objective indices of their potential to which they can turn; peers therefore do not become more important for them as they near the end of the high school tenure.

The fact that girls have more powerful parents and values can also be related to discrepancies in future social roles. It has already been mentioned that parents probably feel a greater need to be protective of their daughters than their sons, particularly in adolescence. In part the dependence which this protection may cause the daughter to feel is an appropriate and consistent precursor of the later dependence on a husband which she will be expected to maintain. The fact that the power of the father appears greater for older

girls (though again the difference between father power for 10th and 12th grade girls does not reach an acceptable level of significance) is also consistent with the notion that she is preparing for a future role encompassing dependence on a male. Boys, however, find it necessary to shift from a role in which they are most strongly oriented toward the influence of their parents to one in which they are relatively dominant and independent (the "dominance-submission discontinuity" identified by Benedict, 1938). This is reflected in Table 15, in a smaller amount of parental power for older than for younger boys. This difference however, only occurs between 11th and 12th grade for a reason which the writer is unable to determine and approaches (but does not reach) significance only for mother power. At the same time, the power of boys' values increases with age (with a significant difference between values for 10th and 12th grade boys). Internal guidance becomes relatively more important as boys approach their new independent status. Yet girls have significantly more powerful values than do boys for every age group, although the discrepancy is reduced for the older groups. It is possible that values are instilled into girls more strongly by their parents due to their greater protective concern about their conduct, and that girls therefore also learn to place greater reliance and emphasis on the influence of their own values. Having powerful values may also be an element involved in the husband-competition. A "good reputation" is undoubtedly widely perceived by girls to be an important requirement for attracting a desireable husband. (It has been seen that reputation

is more frequently mentioned by girls than boys among the reasons for the reported decisions in certain of the situations in Table 24). Because obeying those values which relate to reputation is the surest way to protect it, the influence of values in general (and hence their power) becomes greatly important.

Perhaps the most puzzling difference between boys and girls which is shown in Table 15 is that between their mean scores for the power of impulses. This difference gets larger with succeeding grades. It is significant for the totals and for 11th and 12th grades, but not for 10th grade. The following explanation seems most consistent with preceding remarks. There seems to be a general expectation, in the American culture, for women to be less intelligent, less rational, more emotional, and "unreasonable," more changeable ("the woman's prerogative") etc., than men. In order to appear feminine (and therefore desirable) women may strive to live up to some aspects of this stereotype. Two studies provide evidence for this point. Komarovsky (1952) found that college girls often go to great lengths to hide or minimize their intellectual abilities, particularly when in the company of less intelligent boys. Sontag, Baker, and Nelson (1958), in a longitudinal study of IQ changes, found that male children show greater mean IQ increases than do female children. From the present point of view, each of these findings is consistent with the cultural masculine-feminine role differentiations; the male is encouraged to develop intellectual powers in order to succeed at school and occupation, the female to minimize them in order to compete effectively for a desirable husband. If

it can be assumed that "impulses" as measured in the present study, are part of the same stereotyped feminine pattern, this may indicate a possible reason for the relatively more powerful impulses which are found for girls than for boys. The fact that the difference is greater for older groups is also consistent with this interpretation, perhaps being due to the greater imminence of the competition for older girls.

Coercion and Need for Independence, by Sex and Grade

Boys have a significantly greater mean need for independence score than do girls. This is consistent with their differential sex-role identifications. Yet boys do not appear to increase in this need with age, as would have been expected if it were reflecting increasing manifestation of the characteristics identified with the adult male role. Perhaps this is one aspect of the adult role which males feel themselves ready for relatively early.

Parental coerciveness scores can be seen to show decreases with succeeding age groups for both sexes (although only significantly so for the differences between 10th and 12th grade boys for mother coercion; 10th and 11th, and 10th and 12th grade girls for father coercion; and 10th and 11th grade girls for mother coercion). Parents may feel overt punishment to be less appropriate and less effective as their children approach adulthood.

Of greater interest are the facts that boys have significantly more coercive fathers than mothers, and significantly more coercive fathers than do girls; while girls have

significantly more coercive mothers than fathers, but no difference in the coerciveness of their mothers from that of boys. Findings similar to this were reported by Bronfenbrenner (1958b) and by Minkowich (1958), demonstrating adolescents and college students to receive more punishment from the parent of the same sex. These results are in contradiction to the psychoanalytic notion (as formulated by Fenichel, 1945) that the father is the major disciplinarian for children of both sexes. If it can be assumed that the other results noted in Table 15 are in fact representative of differential sex-role identifications between the boys and girls in our sample, the parental coercion findings should also be related to these identifications. The simplest interpretation would be that the learning of the set of values involved in a sex-role identification is induced primarily by the parent of the same sex, that the "teaching" involved in this process involves a certain degree of punishment, and that therefore the same-sex parent is the more coercive. A simplified Oedipal theory, treating boys and girls in a parallel fashion, can also be made consistent with these data. According to this theory, the parent of the same sex frustrates incestuous desires for the parent of the opposite sex, and the child allays the anxiety which the perceived threat of catastrophic punishment arouses by identifying with the punishing parent. It is not clear that this latter theory demands actual punishment rather than its perceived potential. It is also not clearly indicated that it is a process which continues into adolescence. For these reasons the first seems perhaps the more justifiable

explanation of the results.

Power by Social Class

Table 16 presents mean power scores for each guide by class and sex groupings.

TABLE 16

MEAN POWER BY CLASS AND SEX

Class	Sex	N	Father Power	Mother Power	Peer Power	Impulse Power	Value Power
White Collar	Boys	63	126.6 (62)*	126.7	96.7	105.4	120.4
	Girls	61	132.3	136.7 (60)	111.3	114.8	131.0
Total White Collar		124	129.4 (123)	131.6 (123)	103.9	110.0	125.6
Blue Collar	Boys	74	121.8	124.9	96.6	104.5	115.7
	Girls	114	125.0 (112)	129.1 (112)	105.5	111.7	126.1
Total Blue Collar		189	123.7 (186)	127.4 (186)	102.0	108.9	122.0

*Reduced N's (shown in parentheses) are due to cases in which the respondent was living with only one parent, and therefore gave no power score for the absent parent. These reductions are smaller than in Table 15 because the class groupings, based on father's occupation, omit respondents without fathers entirely.

The differences between boys and girls for power scores, noted in the discussion of Table 15, show up within class groups as well. Also evident in Table 16 is a small but apparently consistent difference between the two class groups in their mean power scores, with the white collar grouping having the

predominance. The differences reach significance with father power for both boys and girls, with mother and peer power for girls only, and with value power for both boys and girls. These differences are partially in accord with some studies of class differences in child-rearing practices (Chapter I), which showed white collar parents to be more protective and controlling, more achievement oriented than blue collar parents. Children whose parents are more protective (and earlier evidence in this study has shown that white collar parents are in fact exerting more influence in situations which would seem to be suitable for their protective efforts) can be assumed to develop stronger orientations toward their parents' influence, if the protection has not reached an extreme degree. These children are perhaps taught to place greater emphasis on the importance of this influence. By the same token, their values are stronger, since they have been subject to a more intensive and deliberate process of socialization, their parents feeling it to be of great importance to have and to follow a strong set of values. The fact that peers of white collar girls have more power than those of blue collar, while for the two groups of boys they are equal, is consistent with some earlier speculations. If peers do serve an important function of setting and disseminating standards for attractiveness and reputation for girls, and if the protective content of these standards has more salience for white-collar girls (due to the greater emphasis which it has been given by their parents), then white-collar girls might be expected to develop stronger orientations toward peer influence than blue-collar girls.

The Davis and Havighurst findings about class differences (1952) indicated greater impulsiveness and freedom for the lower class. Yet impulse power is not significantly greater in the present results for blue-collar respondents than for white-collar. In fact, the small differences which appear are in the other direction. Bronfenbrenner (1958a) indicates that recent studies show decreasing differences between classes with regard to permissiveness and freedom; while white-collar parents still preponderate in their value and achievement expectations. These results are in agreement with the present ones, where both classes show approximately equal orientations toward impulses, while those toward parents and values are stronger for the white-collar respondents.

Coerciveness and Need for Independence by Social Class

Table 17 presents mean coerciveness and need for independence scores for the two class groupings.

The blue-collar respondents show a greater need for independence than do the white-collar respondents (significant for the totals and for girls, but not for boys, though they show a difference in the same direction). This is consistent with the finding that white-collar respondents have stronger parental power, since it has been postulated, and found, that parental power and need for independence are negatively related. Presumably the blue-collar adolescents, having a history of less parental control, are relatively more on their own, and for this reason have a stronger need for independence (assuming that the development of a <u>need</u> for independence is not inconsistent

TABLE 17

MEAN COERCIVENESS AND NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE SCORES BY CLASS AND SEX

Class	Sex	N	Father Coercion	Mother Coercion	Peer Coercion	Need for Independence
White Collar	Boys	63	25.8 (62)*	20.9	16.1	39.0
	Girls	61	18.8	21.2 (60)	13.1	35.0
White Collar Total. . . .		124	22.4 (123)	21.0 (123)	14.6	37.0
Blue Collar	Boys	74	24.4	23.3	17.3	40.2
	Girls	114	22.0 (112)	23.4 (112)	12.9	37.7
Blue Collar Total. . . .		188	22.9 (186)	23.4 (186)	14.7	38.7

*Reduced N's (shown in parentheses) are due to the fact that some respondents had an absent parent.

with actual independence). But since white-collar boys are being more deliberately trained for the adult male role, of which independence is a crucial characteristic, their need for independence is not significantly lower than that of blue-collar boys, despite the fact that they perhaps have less experience at actual independence. White-collar girls, on the other hand, have been more protected in the past than blue-collar girls, and are being prepared for an adult role characterized by dependence. Thus there is less to oppose the female blue-collar predominance in need for independence.

There is only one significant difference in mean

coerciveness scores between classes. This is again in line with Bronfenbrenner's analysis of recent trends in child training (1958a), showing that discrepancies in punishment between the classes are no longer very pronounced. The significant difference which occurs is that between white and blue-collar girls in father coerciveness, the blue-collar fathers being more coercive. Girls were also the only group to show a significant difference in need for independence between classes. It is possible that blue-collar girls have a reaction to fairly strong father coercion as one determinant of their high need for independence. Blue-collar parents apparently do not treat their children as distinctively as do white-collar parents. The previously-noted greater coercion from the same-sex parent only shows up significantly for the white-collar respondents. But blue-collar girls may have a standard which is more similar to the white-collar patterns; so that they react to the coercion of their fathers with an increased need for independence.

Power, Parental Coercion, and Need for Independence Intercorrelations

Correlations among some of the variables which have been discussed are presented in Table 18.

Power scores for the five behavior guides are generally highly correlated. Although this may be partially due to the similarity of the scales used for the measurements of power, the fact that these correlations are not uniformly equally high indicates that the guides were being considered distinctively to some extent. With some exceptions, the groupings of guides which were indicated from the examination of the mean scores

TABLE 18

CORRELATIONS BETWEEN POWER, NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE, AND PARENTAL COERCIVENESS

		N[a]	Mother Power	Peer Power	Impulse Power	Value Power	Need for Independence	Father Coercion	Mother Coercion
Father Power	Boys	148	.520[c]	.397[c]	.456[c]	.491[c]	-.139	-.242[c]	-.023
	Girls	195	.636[c]	.343[c]	.430[c]	.459[c]	-.159[b]	-.210[c]	-.264[c]
	Total	343	.596[c]	.384[c]	.454[c]	.485[c]	-.168[c]	-.244[c]	-.161[c]
Mother Power	Boys	148		.307[c]	.463[c]	.380[c]	-.122	-.247[c]	-.156
	Girls	195		.391[c]	.522[c]	.548[c]	-.134	-.269[c]	-.303[c]
	Total	343		.382[c]	.512[c]	.497[c]	-.153[c]	-.285[c]	-.240[c]
Peer Power	Boys	148			.569[c]	.495[c]	-.097	-.142	-.101
	Girls	195			.543[c]	.472[c]	-.014	-.156[b]	-.136
	Total	343			.578[c]	.517[c]	-.087	-.198[c]	-.113[b]
Impulse Power	Boys	148				.588[c]	-.071	-.253[c]	-.098
	Girls	195				.551[c]	-.138	-.251[c]	-.187[b]
	Total	343				.590[c]	-.139[b]	-.285[c]	-.142[b]
Value Power	Boys	148					-.073	-.209[b]	-.203[b]
	Girls	195					-.097	-.104	-.066
	Total	343					-.125[b]	-.197[c]	-.115[b]
Need for Independence	Boys	148						.113	.086
	Girls	195						.011	-.092
	Total	343						.084	-.028
Father Coercion	Boys	148							.604[c]
	Girls	195							.667[c]
	Total	343							.621[c]

[a]Only respondents for whom measures had been taken on each of the above variables could be used in these intercorrelations; hence the reduced totals.

[b]"Possible" significant correlation ($p < .05$) by simple random sample estimation; see Appendix A.

[c]"Probable" significant correlation ($p < .05$ by 40 half-sample estimation; see Appendix A). The different tests of significance are not independent, but the degree to which one is influenced by another is not known.

are evidenced in the intercorrelations. Father power is most highly correlated with that of mother, and next most with that of values (although impulse power shows only faintly lower correlations with father power than does value power). Mother power is most highly related to father power, but again there is little difference between impulses and values in their correlations with mother, this time impulses having the general edge. Boys show a relatively low correlation between mother and value power, while for females the correlation is relatively high. It is consistent with the notion that males learn their values primarily from the father that they should have a lower correlation between mother and value power than between father and value power. By the same token girls would be expected to show a greater correlation between mother and values, and this is also found. Yet the differences within each of these pairs of correlations do not reach significance.

Peer power is most highly correlated with impulse power, but the correlations with value power are not much lower. Impulse power is most highly correlated with value power, and next most with peer power. The fact that the power scores of impulses and values are fairly highly correlated with each of the other guides, and most highly correlated to each other seems inconsistent with some of the earlier findings. For it will be recalled that the means of the power scores fell into two clear groupings, with parents and values much more powerful than peers and impulses. The present findings together with the earlier ones, would seem to indicate that an individual perhaps has a general level of strength underlying all his power

orientations, so that an individual with a higher general level will tend to have higher scores for all the guides than one with a lower level, though the absolute differences between the various power scores may be equally discrepant for both cases. This may be particularly true between impulses and values, where an individual with stronger impulse power finds it necessary to have still stronger value power in order to be able to counteract his impulses.

Need for independence has a small negative correlation with each of the guides' power scores. Correlations between the totals reach "possible" significance ($p < .05$ by one or the other of the estimations) with each of the guides but peers. Correlations for the boys alone do not reach significance for any of these five cases, while girls have a "possibly" significant negative correlation only between father power and need for independence. The negative trend is strongest between parental power and need for independence. This was expected; the two measures were thought to be reflecting opposed phenomena. Yet the faintness of the trends, even in these cases, indicates that while the measures are somewhat opposed, there are other factors which influence one or the other of them individually. It was also expected that a need for independence would relate to an increased orientation toward the internal influence sources, values and impulses. That is to say, positive correlations were expected between these guides and need for independence, while small negative correlations are found (though they do not reach significance when boys and girls are considered separately). But it has just been seen that both impulse and value power are

relatively highly correlated to parental power. The general factor which was suggested to underly the power orientations may be also determining their rather similar relationships to need for independence.

Need for independence theoretically has at least two sources. These were discussed somewhat in the first chapter. On the one hand, it is a concomitant of a masculine role identification. On the other hand, it may involve a rejection of parental influence. The difference between need for independence of these two types lies in the degree to which the parents foster and accept the need. Parents who are deliberately training their son for a masculine role may teach him to value his independence, and yet may be in some conflict over giving up their control over him. This conflict may be reflected in the son's own inner orientations. Thus he may try to increase his need for independence, in accordance with the desired masculine role, without appreciably lessening his respect for his parents' influence. One would expect need for independence in females to be more of a negative reaction to parental influence, since it is less a quality which is induced by parents in their daughters as part of the appropriate feminine role and its development would be more manifestly opposed by them. Yet the differences between boys and girls in the correlations between parents and need for independence are minute, though in the direction indicated by this discussion.

Additional information on this point can be obtained by examining the correlations under the parental coerciveness columns. There is no direct relationship between parental

coerciveness and need for independence, the correlations all being below the level of significance. This supports neither the expectation that need for independence is sometimes a rejection of parental influence, nor that it is a result of positive training, though the two processes might be producing influence in opposite directions, which cancel each other out. However, there does seem to be an indirect relationship between need for independence and parental coerciveness. Small but significant negative correlations between parental power and need for independence have been mentioned. There are also significant negative correlations (by the 40 half-sample estimation) between parental coerciveness and parental power scores. But the fact that there is no significant correlation between coercion and need for independence indicates that two unrelated processes are occurring. In the first process, extreme parental coercion may cause resentment in adolescents which is expressed by lower reported orientations toward the influence of their parents; yet the need for independence is not allowed to increase because the parents actually maintain strong control over the child; while in the other process, the need for independence may be allowed to develop, and is perhaps fostered by those parents who are not extremely coercive, and results in lower parental power with their approval.[1]

---

[1]This latter process seems consistent with a substantial positive correlation reported by Bandura and Walters (1958) between "dependency" in adolescents and the extent to which their thoughts and actions are modeled after those of their parents. The former would seem to be the reverse of independence, while the latter is similar to parental power.

There are differences in some of the coercion-power correlations between mother coercion and either mother or father power, while girls do have "probable" significant negative correlations between father coercion and father and mother power. Earlier, the possibility was discussed that coerciveness from the same-sex parent is related to a positive identification. The negative correlations which appear between parental coercion and parental power do not support this. The parent power-parent coercion pattern is repeated in the correlations between coerciveness and impulse power, where there are "possibly" significant negative correlations for both sexes with father coerciveness, and for girls but not boys with mother coerciveness. Yet parental coerciveness would have been expected to relate positively rather than negatively with the power of impulses. Value power shows a "possibly" significant negative correlation with both mother and father coercion for boys, but not girls. Since values are representatives of parental standards, it is not surprising that they show the same relationship to parental coercion, in their power scores, as parents do. Yet it is puzzling to find boys alone showing this influence with value power. Boys have a significantly lower mean value power score than do girls (Table 15); they consider the influence of their values to be less important than do girls. Perhaps boys can manifest a negative reaction to the coerciveness of parents in a low orientation toward their values, while girls feel a stronger identification with their values and cannot maintain a low orientation without diminishing their self-respect. Perhaps girls have a more consistent negative relationship between

parental coerciveness and parental power because they are less free to use value power as an outlet for the expression of resentment. A point which is unexplained, however, is that father coerciveness is related to boys' father, mother, and impulse power, while mother coerciveness is not.

Family Coercion Patterns and Identification

In order to investigate further the relationship of punishment to the development of orientations to guide influence, patterns of coercion within the family were examined. Some previous research has shown a relationship between the identity of the dominant disciplinarian in the family and both aggression and the projection of blame inward or outward (Henry, 1956; King and Henry, 1955). Since the power scores are considered personality-related, it was thought that they might similarly be affected by punishment patterns in the family. The respondents in the present study were accordingly divided into two groups; those whose mother coercion scores were greater than their father coercion scores (the "mother dominant" group), and those whose father coercion scores were greater than their mother coercion scores (the "father dominant" group).

Previous results in the present study and in studies by Minkowich (1958) and Bronfenbrenner (1958b) have indicated that adolescents typically receive more punishment from the parent of the same sex than the other. Table 19 indicates that this trend exists strongly for the groups which fill the criteria of father and mother dominance.

It was postulated earlier that the development of an

TABLE 19

FATHER AND MOTHER DOMINANCE IN COERCION BY SEX

Coercion Grouping	Boys	Girls
Father Dominant	84	60
Mother Dominant	46	96

N = 286

$X^2 = 19.14$

$p < .01$

appropriate sex role identification could be fostered by a slight dominance in punishment from the parent of the same sex. Yet, negative correlations were found between parental coerciveness and various power scores, and negligible ones were found between coerciveness and need for independence. These facts contradict this expectation. The following analysis investigates this relationship in terms of the pattern of relative coerciveness within the family. The concomitants of adequate sex role identification which have been discussed should be more closely approximated for the groups with the same sex parent the dominant coercer if the earlier expectation is true. Table 20 presents the percentage of respondents giving each guide a high power ranking (see n. a to Table 20). The expectations are not supported. There are no significant differences between the father dominant and mother dominant groups, though there are four fairly sizable differences. For the boys, the father dominant group has more highly ranked values, and less highly ranked impulses than the mother dominant group. These

TABLE 20

RANKED POWER SCORES BY COERCION PATTERNS AND SEX

Coercion Pattern[b]	Sex	N	Per Cent of Fathers Ranked High (1, 2)[a]	Per Cent of Mothers Ranked High (1)[a]	Per Cent of Peers Ranked High (1,2,3,4)[a]	Per Cent of Impulses Ranked High (1,2,3)[a]	Per Cent of Values Ranked High (1, 2)[a]
Father Dominant	Boys	83	71	51	42	24	45
Mother Dominant	Boys	46	74	46	35	39	35
Father Dominant	Girls	60	62	50	52	23	55
Mother Dominant	Girls	96	50	47	49	33	54

[a]The five power scores were ranked, for each individual in accordance with their relative magnitude, the highest score receiving rank 1, second highest rank 2, etc. For the present analysis these ranks were dichotomized at the approximate median for each guide. Since some guides were consistently ranked higher than others, the splits between high and low occur at different points for different guides. The percentages which are presented are based on the number of cases with the high ranking, as defined at the top of each column, out of the total with all five possible rankings.

[b]The father dominant group consists of all respondents whose father coercion scores were greater than their mother coercion scores; the mother dominant group consists of all respondents whose mother coercion scores were greater than their father coercion scores.

differences are both in the direction which would be expected if the father dominant group were manifesting a more adequate identification. But the differences which would be expected for parents and peers are not found. For girls, the results deviate farther from the expectations. The two sizable differences which are found are both in the wrong direction. Mother

dominant girls have less highly ranked fathers and more highly ranked impulses than father dominant girls. Apparently the family coercion patterns, while strongly related to the sex of the individual, are not directly related to the strength of the various orientations to influence.

Need for independence has been discussed as another indicator of adequate sex role identification. Table 21 presents mean need for independence scores for the parental coercion groupings. Although neither of the differences between the mother and father dominant groups are significant, they are in the expected direction. Boys with adequate identification should show a high need for independence, and in Table 21 their need for independence is slightly higher for the father dominant group. Girls with adequate identification, on the other hand, should show a relatively low need for independence, and Table 21 shows theirs to be lower for the mother dominant group.

TABLE 21

MEAN NEED FOR INDEPENDENCE SCORES BY COERCION PATTERN AND SEX

Coercion Pattern	Boys	Girls
Father Dominant	39.20	37.88
Mother Dominant	38.63	35.82

In Table 18 there were no significant correlations between parental coerciveness and need for independence, but there were several significant negative correlations between the coerciveness of one or both parents and the various power scores. In conjunction with the present results, we are led

to conclude the following: The absolute degree of coerciveness of each parent considered separately is a more important determinant of power scores, particularly those of the parents, than is the relative dominance in coerciveness of one parent over the other. Need for independence is unrelated to coerciveness, either with the parents considered separately or in conjunction.

The fact that coerciveness was negatively related to nearly all power scores opposes the notion that it is a concomitant of adequate identification. Yet the fact that most girls have dominant mothers and most boys have dominant fathers seems to uphold it. Dominance in coercion of the parent of the same sex is the typical pattern; unless identification is considered to be an abnormal phenomenon, one would think that it would be most manifested by those adolescents showing the typical pattern.

Lippitt and Hoffman (1959) found that 3rd-6th grade boys whose parents were coercive but also gave "autonomy," were liked by their peers, friendly, influential, and performed well academically. These qualities may be related to a positive identification for boys. If the same process exists for the respondents in the present study, it may explain some of the apparent inconsistency. Perhaps coerciveness combined with autonomy (which can perhaps be considered one kind of "independence training" in terms of the present study) produces a positive identification (at least for males), whereas coerciveness without autonomy produces a rejection of identification. There is no measure of autonomy in the present study; therefore this

speculation cannot be tested.

Summary

Mean power scores fell into two groups, with parents and values relatively high, and peers and impulses relatively low. The power scores were generally fairly highly correlated between the five guides. Girls were found generally to have more powerful guides than did boys. Boys had a stronger need for independence than did girls. These male-female differences were interpreted as being related to the differential social roles being prepared for by boys and by girls.

Boys also had more coercive fathers than mothers, while girls had more coercive mothers than fathers. Family coercion patterns were unrelated to either need for independence or power, although the coerciveness of father and mother considered separately was generally significantly negatively correlated with parental power. Coerciveness was unrelated to need for independence, but need for independence had small negative correlations with the power scores, most strongly so with those of the parents.

White-collar respondents had more powerful parents and values, and a weaker need for independence than did blue-collar respondents. There was practically no difference between classes in amount of parental coerciveness.

CHAPTER VI

PREDICTION OF THE DECISION

Influence of Power and Relevance on the Decision

The major hypotheses of the study were tested by means of a series of multiple regression analyses. This method seemed particularly appropriate since it could give information as to the relative degree of influence of each of the independent variables on the dependent variables, and could indicate as well the extent to which all five independent variables taken together, combine to influence the decision. Four sets of regression analyses were done: one (called "direction of relevance") weighting each guide by the direction advocated, with a +1 assigned to one direction, a -1 to the other, and a 0 to "nonrelevance"; one using the power scores for each guide, multiplied by the direction of relevance; one using the strength of relevance scores (with the direction as an intrinsic element of the strength of relevance); and one using the product of the power and strength of relevance scores for each guide. The dependent variable for each type of analysis was the decision reported by the respondent, with a 0 assigned to one decision alternative, a 1 to the other. Since only eight of the decision situations in the study presented two clear alternatives to the respondents, only these could be used in the regression

analysis. Here are the hypotheses presently to be tested:

1a. The stronger the force exerted by a guide (the product of power and strength of relevance), the greater will be its influence on a decision.

1b. The total "resultant" force, produced by all the guides simultaneously should accurately predict the decision.

2. The more power a guide has, the greater will be its influence on a decision.

3. The stronger the relevance of a guide, the greater will be its influence on a decision.

4. The force of power times strength of relevance will be a better predictor of the decision than either power or strength of relevance taken separately, both for the individual guides and for the "resultant forces" of the simultaneous influence of all the guides in a situation.

The results of the regression analyses are presented in Table 22. Since measures of strength of relevance were taken only in the hypothetical situations, only these have multiple regression analyses using strength of relevance and using the product of power and strength of relevance as the conditioning factors on the independent variables. An exception to this is the Ask Out situation, where the strength of relevance was structured for all guides and the respondent was only asked for the decision. Because there was no variation between respondents in the relevance structure of this situation, only the power regression analysis could be done.

The conditioning variables involved in the regression analyses overlap to a certain extent. The direction of relevance was involved in each type of analysis; in the power times strength of relevance and the strength of relevance analyses because it is operationally and conceptually an integral part of strength of relevance; and in the power analysis because

TABLE 22

MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Situation, Sex, and Type of Analysis[a]	N[b]	Standard Partial Regression Coefficients					Multiple Correlation
		Father	Mother	Peers	Impulses	Values	
Party-Aunt							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	135	.207[c]	.198[c]	e	.156	.110	.400[d]
Strength of Relevance	135	.173[c]	.204[c]	.094	.198[c]	.124	.472[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	135	.235[c]	.205[c]	-.182[c]	.157[c]	.130	.468[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	135	.219[c]	.193[c]	-.061	.208[c]	.149	.483[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	180	.061	.243[d]	e	.107	.243[d]	.407[d]
Strength of Relevance	180	.114	.129	.020	.117	.322[d]	.447[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	180	.020	.263[d]	.078	.078	.257[d]	.407[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	180	.058	.160[c]	.071	.078	.326[d]	.437[d]
Copying							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	136	.293[d]	.017	.250[d]	.351[d]	.066	.636[d]
Strength of Relevance	136	.205	.052	.193[c]	.333[d]	.042	.627[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	136	.258[c]	.041	.229[d]	.331[d]	-.010	.615[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	136	.205	.090	.172[c]	.316[d]	.048	.620[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	189	.181[d]	.173[c]	.173[c]	.397[d]	.146[c]	.699[d]
Strength of Relevance	189	.129	.176[c]	.107	.382[d]	.092	.663[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	189	.112	.159[c]	.108	.414[d]	.148[c]	.675[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	189	.079	.163[c]	.115	.393[d]	.104	.655[d]
Stay-Go							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	143	e	e	e	.159	.127	.210[c]
Strength of Relevance	143	.287[d]	(parents)	.069	.166[c]	.125	.410[d]

TABLE 22--Continued

Situation, Sex, and Type of Analysis[a]	N[b]	Standard Partial Regression Coefficients					Multiple Correlation
		Father	Mother	Peers	Impulses	Values	
Stay-Go, Boys (continued)							
Power x Direction of Relevance	143	-.034	.176	-.051	.101	.126	.264[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	143	-.013	.326[c]	.010	.112	.126	.419[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	192	[e]	[e]	[e]	.182[c]	.309[d]	.375[c]
Strength of Relevance	192	.262[d]	(parents)	.025	.175[c]	.210[c]	.483[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	192	.051	-.017	-.017	.193[c]	.297[d]	.378[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	192	.185	.114	-.004	.179[c]	.159	.474[d]
Friend's Home							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	129	e	e	.136	.162[c]	.436[d]	.538[d]
Strength of Relevance	129	f	f	.123	.201[c]	.467[d]	.595[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	129	.229[c]	.072	.132	.117	.415[d]	.607[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	129	.215[c]	.039	.110	.140	.454[d]	.636[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	168	e	e	.198[d]	.161[c]	.523[d]	.660[d]
Strength of Relevance	168	f	f	.151[c]	.212[d]	.532[d]	.689[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	168	.069	.085	.198[d]	.140[c]	.525[d]	.694[d]
Power x Strength of Relevance	168	.046	.080	.166[c]	.180[d]	.520[d]	.701[d]
Go Steady							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	87	-.053	.008	.061	.710[d]	.089	.762[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	87	.035	-.005	.077	.646[d]	.086	.705[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	141	.004	.067	.057	.680[d]	.107	.793[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	141	-.030	.085	.041	.669[d]	.106	.781[d]

TABLE 22--Continued

Situation, Sex, and Type of Analysis[a]	N[b]	Standard Partial Regression Coefficients					Multiple Correlation
		Father	Mother	Peers	Impulses	Values	
Getting Job							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	135	.158	.000	.042	.264[d]	.301[d]	.445[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	135	.166	-.034	.022	.271[d]	.289[d]	.442[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	138	.132	.243[c]	.027	.017	-.122	.325[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	138	.107	.219[c]	.050	.027	-.122	.299[d]
Joining Club							
Boys							
Direction of Relevance	102	.246[c]	-.087	.125	.275[c]	.086	.473[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	102	.199	-.046	.100	.230[c]	.049	.392[d]
Girls							
Direction of Relevance	147	.072	.158[c]	-.003	.552[d]	.136[c]	.694[d]
Power x Direction of Relevance	147	.016	.197[c]	-.058	.536[d]	.156[c]	.666[d]
Ask Out							
Boys							
Power x Direction of Relevance	142	.218[c]	.190	-.057	-.128	-.069	.214[c]
Girls							
Power x Direction of Relevance	190	-.004	-.024	.063	.195[c]	.171	.178[c]

[a]The regression analyses represented in this table used four different combinations of conditioning variables; the first predicted the decision from the direction of relevance indicated by each guide, the second by the power scores of each guide multiplied by the direction of relevance, the third by the strength of each guide's relevance (which also includes the direction implicitly), and the fourth from the product of the strength of relevance and the power score for each guide.

[b]The N for each situation consists of all respondents who gave power scores for each parent and relevance scores for each guide.

[c]"Possible" significance by simple random sampling variance estimation ($p < .05$; see Appendix A).

[d]"Probable" significance by 40 half-sample variance estimation ($p < .05$; see Appendix A). The various significance tests are not independent, but the degree to which one depends on another is not known.

[e]The direction of relevance was constructed into the situation for these guides.

[f]The strength of relevance was constructed into the situation for these guides.

power could not be correlated with a decision without accounting for the direction in which the power was utilized. It is hoped that a comparison of the four analyses will make it possible to determine the relative contribution of each of the conditioning variables.

The direction of relevance was not involved in a specific hypothesis, but since it is contained within the other variables it can be used as a base against which to compare their influence. Table 22 shows significant multiple correlations with the direction of relevance analysis in every situation for both boys and girls. There are also some significant regression coefficients in every situation for girls, and in every one but Stay-Go for boys. It is thus clear that the direction of relevance is related to the individual's decision, though the fact that there are variations between the multiple correlations in the various situations and between the regression coefficients for various guides indicates that some other factor or factors may also be involved in determining which guides will be influential in each situation.

The other types of regression analysis show results very similar to those obtained with the direction of relevance analysis:

The strength of relevance analysis produces regression coefficients which in most instances are similar to or lower than those produced by the direction of relevance analysis. The multiple correlations are (nonsignificantly) larger for the strength of relevance in three of the four situations involved in the comparison, but the increases in two of these

three (Party-Aunt and Stay-Go) are undoubtedly mainly due to the fact that more variables were involved in the strength of relevance analysis (the direction but not strength of relevance having been built in for some of the guides in these situations, so that all the guides could be used in the strength of relevance analysis while those with direction given could not be used in the direction of relevance analysis because of their lack of variation). The other situation which showed an increase in the multiple correlation from the direction of relevance to the strength of relevance analysis was Friend's Home. The increases which are found in this situation are also not significant.

The strength of relevance analysis also produces slightly larger regression coefficients in a few instances, but none of them significantly larger. Some of the differences in the other direction are greater, though also not significant (girls' values in Stay-Go, girls' mothers in Party-Aunt). But there is some evidence that strength of relevance produces an influence when the direction of relevance is controlled. It was mentioned that two of the situations had the direction indicated by some guides given to the respondent, but not the strength of relevance. The measures of strength of relevance for these guides were independent of their directions of relevance, since the latter were identical for everyone. Therefore the regression coefficients for these guides in the strength of relevance analysis should be reflecting strength of relevance relatively purely. Boys and girls have significant regression coefficients for parents in the Stay-Go situation in this

analysis, but not for peers (for whom the same conditions hold). There are also no regression coefficients which reach significance in the strength of relevance analysis for peers in the Party-Aunt situation, though the direction was given for them as well. It appears that strength of relevance can (but will not necessarily) produce an influence when direction of relevance is held constant.

The results for the power (times direction of relevance) regression analysis are also quite similar to those for the analysis using direction of relevance alone. The power multiple correlations are higher (but not significantly) only in those cases in which more guides are involved in that regression analysis than are in the direction of relevance analysis (Party-Aunt, Stay-Go, Friend's Home). The power regression coefficients follow the direction of relevance coefficients even more closely than do the strength of relevance coefficients. But the cases in which the direction of relevance is held constant can again be examined in order to estimate the influence of power uncontaminated by the direction of relevance. Guides in two situations additional to those considered in this way for the strength of relevance can be used; the Friend's Home situation, where the direction and the strength of relevance were predetermined for the parents, and the Ask Out situation, where the direction and strength of relevance was given to the respondent for every guide. In these cases, as well as for parents and peers in Stay-Go, and peers in Party-Aunt, the power score for each individual was weighted by the direction given for that guide, the direction being the same for everyone. There are several

significant power regression coefficients among the above-mentioned cases; boys' peers in Party-Aunt, boys' fathers in Friend's Home, boys' fathers in Ask Out, and girls' impulses in Ask Out. Again, significance is not found in each of the instances when direction of relevance is controlled, but the results are sufficient to indicate that power can produce influence given such a condition.

The regression analysis utilizing the product of power and strength of relevance for each guide shows few differences from either of the other three regression analyses. According to Hypothesis 4, this analysis would have been expected to yield the greatest regression coefficients and multiple correlations. But this analysis produces the highest multiple correlations only in a few instances (boys in the Party-Aunt, Stay-Go, and Friend's Home situations; girls in the Friend's Home situation), while in one case it produces the lowest of the four multiple correlations (girls in the copying situation). None of these represent significant discrepancies.

The regression coefficients are the largest for this analysis in a few instances, but always by very slight (non-significant) margins (boys' impulses and values and girls' values in the Party-Aunt situation; boys' mothers and girls' peers in the Copying situation, and boys' mothers in the Stay-Go situation). The power times strength of relevance regression analysis seems more likely to produce regression coefficients which are the smallest of the analyses; though these are usually by small margins also (they are found for boys' peers and girls' impulses in the Party-Aunt situation, boys' fathers,

peers, and impulses, and girls' fathers in the Copying situation, boys' fathers and peers, and girls' peers and values in the Stay-Go situation, boys' fathers, mothers, and peers, and girls' fathers, mothers, and values in the Friend's Home situation). The hypotheses to which this analysis is related (1a, 1b, and 4 are not supported.

These findings suggest some modifications in the theory presented in Chapter I, particularly with regard to the relative importance of the various elements involved in determining the decision. The most important determinant of the decision is the direction advocated by the guide. Adding either strength of relevance or power to that direction does not increase the influence of a guide or improve the prediction. This would lead one to conclude either that power and strength of relevance have no effect on the decision (that they are essentially adding only random variation to the results produced by direction of relevance alone), or that these variables are not independent, that the measure of direction of relevance is reflecting power and strength of relevance as well.

The fact that both power and strength of relevance demonstrated influence on some occasions when the direction of relevance was controlled opposes the conclusion that they have no effect on the decision. It is not inconsistent, however, with the notion that these variables may be closely related. Power and strength of relevance may be largely included in the measure of direction of relevance and yet manifest an influence on the decision when direction of relevance is controlled. These variables presumably must be represented in the decision

in some way. When a measure of direction of relevance is taken, they are represented in it and the additional variation represented in their more "sensitive" measures is superfluous. When the direction of relevance is structured and not allowed to vary, it does not represent the power and strength of relevance of the involved guides. These variables can then manifest their influences directly.

Earlier results in the present study (see Chapter IV) have shown a slight but consistent relationship between power and both percentage and strength of relevance. This would also seem to support the interpretation that the results are similar between the regression analyses because the conditioning factors are to some degree overlapping. This may also account for the failure of the product of power and strength of relevance to improve the prediction. If these variables are both represented in the measure of direction of relevance, the multiplicative measure of their combination may not improve on the measure of direction of relevance because the latter is already accounting for their combination. It is of course also possible that the model is in error; that even if direction of relevance were completely controlled, it would not improve the prediction made by either power or strength of relevance separately.

The results are not conclusive in regard to the present theory. It seems clear that the single strongest factor involved in producing the decision is the direction of relevance. It seems likely that both power and strength of relevance are reflected in this measure. There is some evidence that power and strength of relevance manifest an influence when the

direction of relevance is controlled. An adequate test of this would require that it be controlled for each guide in a situation, while both strength of relevance and power were allowed to vary. These conditions did not exist for any of the situations in the present study.

Differences in Guide Influence by Situation and Sex

The sizable differences in regression coefficients in Table 22 occur not between the types of regression analysis, but between guides, situations, and sexes. "Appropriateness" is utilized, in the present theory, to account for variations between situations, and was assumed to be strongly related to relevance (Chapter I). If appropriateness were being largely encompassed in the measures of relevance, it would be expected that a guide which was highly relevant to a situation would also have a great deal of influence on the decision (assuming that both relevance and appropriateness are determinants of the decision). If discrepancies occur between the guide-relevance and guide-influence patterns, it may be speculated that appropriateness produces an effect on conformity to influence which is independent of, or additional to its effect on relevance. There may be one set of criteria which determine when influence attempts will be listened to; another which determine when they will be responded to. Among the set of results to be presently investigated will be comparisons between the relevance and influence patterns. It will be seen that some differences between these patterns did occur.

In the Going Steady situation, impulses are extremely

strongly related to the decision, both for males and females, while no other guides are influential (though mother and values are somewhat stronger for girls than boys). The percentage of relevance results for this situation (Table 6) showed impulses to be the most consistently relevant guide. Impulses are apparently both present and acceptable for both boys and girls in this situation which involves an intimate and gratifying relationship.

Boys have significant regression coefficients for impulses and values in the Getting Job situation, while girls have significant coefficients for mother, and have nonsignificant negative coefficients for values. Yet there were no such sex differences in percentage of relevance in this situation; impulses and parents were most relevant for both sexes. The fact was mentioned earlier (Chapter V) that the situation seemed to have a different meaning for boys than girls, relatively more boys having had to make the decision. Boys may rely on their internal guides more because they are relatively familiar with the situation and therefore do not need to accept advice from external sources. Girls; however, being less familiar with this situation, more readily accept advice from their mothers.

Boys and girls also show different patterns in the Joining Club situation. Boys are most influenced here by their fathers and impulses; girls, by their mothers, impulses, and values. Boys' peers are (nonsignificantly) more influential than are girls', while girls' impulses are "possibly" significantly more influential than are boys'. Boys' fathers and peers

were also more relevant than were those of girls (Table 6); the relevance of the other guides was equal between the sexes. It was mentioned earlier that two types of clubs were involved in this decision, "achievement" and "social," and that most adolescents seem to have been considering the former type. Achievement clubs are highly socially evaluated and thus would be expected to be approved by parents and values. Only girls show significant regression coefficients for their values however, and adolescents of each sex show significant influence from the parent of the same sex. Impulses and peers would seem related to the social aspects of this situation, and the fact that girls are more influenced by impulses than are boys, while boys are somewhat more influenced by peers than girls may indicate somewhat different motivations in this situation. Yet in the absence of further data, a reason for this difference is not apparent.

The Party-Aunt situation shows influence to come predominantly from socially-valued sources; there is significant influence from father, mother, and impulses for boys (although they also show a puzzling significant negative regression coefficient for peers in the power analysis, indicating that the more powerful their peers were the less their influence was accepted), and from mother and values for girls. Percentage of relevance however, was uniformly high for the guides in this situation (as for the other hypothetical situations represented in Table 22). Table 7 showed peers, impulses, and values to have relatively great strengths of relevance, for both boys and girls (though girls' values were significantly stronger in relevance than those of boys). Boys apparently do not consider this

situation to be appropriate for only one type of guide, for they respond to the influence of their impulses, as well as their parents. Girls have more strongly relevant values than boys and conform to their influence, as well as to that of their mothers.

The Copying situation shows less difference between the sexes in Table 22. The parent of the same sex is again generally the most influential, impulses produce the most influence of any guide, for both boys and girls, while peers are significantly influential for boys and values are for girls. This was the least structured of the hypothetical situations represented in Table 22. Table 7 showed every guide but peers to be quite strongly relevant, with girls having stronger impulses and values than boys. Strength of relevance here is clearly unrelated to the acceptance of influence. Peers had a low strength of relevance, but have significant regression coefficients for boys; values had a high strength of relevance, but have very low regression coefficients for boys. The male-female differences in influence in this situation can best be considered an internal-external difference. Boys are more concerned with the social consequences of their activity in this classroom situation, while girls are concerned with the consequences for themselves.

A similar pattern occurs in the Ask Out situation, where only boys have a significantly influential parent, but only girls have significantly influential impulses and sizable (but not significant) influence from values. This was inevitably a somewhat different situation for boys than for girls.

Although the attempt was made, in constructing the situation, to make the two forms as similar as possible, one difference could not be avoided; girls were responding to an action which had to be initiated by someone else, while boys initiated the action themselves. This, of course, is part of the general pattern of dating in this culture. Perhaps the fact that girls are obliged to make rapid decisions in this type of situation, sometimes with no prior expectation that a particular boy will ask for a date, teaches them to rely heavily on internal guides in all decisions concerning whether or not to date. Boys, however, do not find it necessary to make such rapid decisions and therefore may habitually seek more external advice in situations concerning dating.

In the Stay-Go situation, girls have generally significant regression coefficients for impulses, while boys do not. Neither boys nor girls have significant regression coefficients for peers, and, switching from the pattern mentioned earlier, boys have significantly more influential mothers than fathers, while girls have nonsignificantly more influential fathers than mothers, particularly in the power times strength of relevance analysis. Table 7 showed relatively strong relevance for the three guides given the measure (peers, impulses, and values), with values significantly stronger for girls than boys. This was a situation which centrally concerned complying or not complying to the influence of the parents in their absence. Boys and girls are approximately equally influenced by the parents (though it is not clear why it is the opposite sex parent primarily, in each case), but girls seem to find internal guides

also appropriate, while boys do not. Girls are more guided by internalized values in this situation, but are also more likely to be influenced by their own impulses.

The Friend's Home situation showed peers to have a relatively low strength of relevance for both boys and girls, in Table 7. Yet peers have significant regression coefficients for girls in Table 22. Females have (nonsignificantly) more influential values than do males in this situation (and also had nonsignificantly more strongly relevant values in Table 7), though both boys' and girls' values have significant regression coefficients. Boys and girls have significant and similar regression coefficients for impulses, and boys have significant coefficients for their fathers but not their mothers, while girls do not for either parent. This may have been a situation somewhat more related to the actual experience of girls than of boys. Some evidence was discussed earlier (Chapter III) which indicated that girls' parents are more concerned for their protection, and are more likely to exert influence in ways consistent with that protection. If this is true, it seems likely that girls are more often forbidden by their parents to see certain friends than are boys. There are two other situations in Table 22 which would be expected to be objects of the parents' protective concern for their daughters, Go Steady and Ask Out. It will be noted that the regression coefficients for parents are quite small for the girls in these situations (although Table 6 showed girls' parents to be significantly more relevant than boys' parents in the Going Steady situation, the only one of these three for which percentage of parental relevance measures

were taken). This would seem to indicate that girls do not consider this protective concern appropriate, and they do not utilize the influence, therefore, in making these decisions. They rely on impulses in all three of these situations, and on values and peers as well in the Friend's Home situation, but not on parents. But if the Friend's Home situation is relatively more unique for boys, they might be more willing to comply to parental influence, reasoning that such a strong demand would not be made by parents who do not usually make such demands, without a good reason. Females also may be more concerned about the possible consequences of this decision on future relations with their peers. If it is a more realistic situation for them, they may be more aware of these possibilities and thus consider their peers to be more appropriate.

With a single exception (the Getting Job situation), girls have more influential values than do boys. Other evidence in the study has shown that girls' values also are more frequently relevant, more strongly relevant, and more powerful than boys' values. No consistent male-female discrepancy exists for impulses in the present table, though females had more powerful (Table 15), but about equally relevant impulses. Peers seem more influential for boys in Table 22, although girls have the greater regression coefficients in one situation (Friend's Home). Girls had more powerful (Table 15), and usually more frequently and more strongly relevant peers (Tables 6 and 7) than boys. The trend for the parent of the same sex to be the most influential has been mentioned. It does not occur in every situation in Table 22, but is fairly general. The same

trend existed for some of the situations with the percentage of relevance measures (Table 6), but not the strength of relevance measures (Table 7). And Table 15 showed girls to have more powerful fathers and mothers than boys. It seems clear that the fact that a guide exerts influence frequently or strongly, or has great power, does not guarantee that this influence will be accepted. The individual must make his judgment as to the appropriateness of this influence before it can have an effect.

Some criteria for determining the appropriateness which helps the individual to judge whether or not to accept influence have been mentioned in the discussion in the preceding pages. The identification of these criteria has been done, of course, by after-the fact speculation and awaits further research for confirmation. But they are criteria which seem probable on the basis of the present evidence. Thus, internal guides seem to be considered appropriate in situations with which the individual is relatively familiar (Getting Job for boys, Friend's Home for girls); while external guides (particularly parents) are appropriate in unfamiliar situations (girls' mothers in Getting Job, boys' fathers in Friend's Home). Parents are appropriate to situations which involve compliance or noncompliance to their demands centrally (Stay-Go), and in those for which they may be considered expert in applying moral standards for conduct (Copying, Party-Aunt). Peers are perhaps most appropriate when the individual is concerned about the consequences of the decision for further interaction with peers (boys in Copying, girls in Friend's Home). Impulses are most

appropriate in the situation which promises the strong gratifications of intimacy (Going Steady). They are involved significantly in nearly every situation, however, though apparently frequently outweighed in importance by other guides. Values seem most appropriate in upholding parental demands (Friend's Home, Stay-Go, Party-Aunt for girls). Surprisingly, they are not very important in the situation which seemed most clearly to involve them, Copying. This is perhaps due to the relative importance of most other guides in this situation, impulses in particular; it was a situation judged more on practical than on moral grounds, particularly for boys.

Conformity to Coercive Influence

One other hypothesis was involved in predicting the decision.

Hypothesis 5: An individual is more likely to conform to the influence of an external guide who has coercive power over him when he is present (able to observe) than when he is absent. Conformity to external guides with other bases of power, with the exception of reward, should be less dependent on their presence.

This hypothesis was tested in the Stay-Go situation, which posed remaining at a party with friends against returning home at the time set by parents. This situation was given in two forms; in one the parents were at home, and would know when their child returned, and in the other they were not at home. The respondents, in the following table, are divided by sex into high and low coerciveness groups for each of the parents, and the percentage of parental conformity is compared between those groups for the conditions with parents at home and away from home.

TABLE 23

CONFORMITY TO PARENTS BY SEX, OBSERVABILITY, AND COERCIVENESS

Sex and Coerciveness group	N	Parents at Home	N	Parents Not Home
Boys				
High Mother Coercion	41	.61	33	.48
Low Mother Coercion	38	.61	39	.46
Girls				
High Mother Coercion	59	.73	50	.71
Low Mother Coercion	51	.88	51	.75
Boys and Girls Combined				
High Mother Coercion	100	.68	83	.64
Low Mother Coercion	89	.76	90	.62
Boys				
High Father Coercion	50	.62	38	.50
Low Father Coercion	29	.59	34	.44
Girls				
High Father Coercion	50	.76	40	.80
Low Father Coercion	60	.83	61	.70
Boys and Girls Combined				
High Father Coercion	100	.69	78	.65
Low Father Coercion	89	.76	95	.61

The hypothesis would lead one to expect a greater excess in conformity in the parents at home condition over the parents not home condition for the high coerciveness groups than the low coerciveness groups. This is not found. In fact there is a fairly consistent trend in the opposite direction. Boys do show increases (which seem consistent, though they fail to reach significance) from the not-home to the at-home conditions, but they show them somewhat more for the low coercive

than the high coercive grouping. Girls show discrepancies in the same direction for the low coerciveness groups (which also miss significance), and show no differences at all between the two conditions for the high coerciveness groups. The differences between the two conditions for the low coerciveness groups do reach the level of "possible" significance when males and females are combined.

The following is offered as a possible explanation of these results. The hypothesis compares the effectiveness of guides with coercive power against that of guides with other bases of power (with the exception of reward). Yet the group which is used to represent the "other bases" is merely that which scored low on coerciveness. The assumption was that the parents represented in this group would be most likely to have referent power relationships with their children. This was perhaps not a valid assumption. Adolescents must continually respond to many influence attempts of many kinds from their parents. It is much more likely with them than with older groups that the parents simultaneously wield power of many or all the types. It was stated in the discussion of this hypothesis that reward power would be expected to operate similarly to coercive power, that is that both would depend on the presence of the power holder for the maximum effect. Then if reward power is operating in the low coerciveness groups, the increase in conformity from the not-home to at-home conditions would be expected for these groups as well as for the high coerciveness groups.

Yet girls showed no difference in the high coerciveness

groups. It is the writer's belief that this can be understood in terms of a difference in the culturally-defined orientation to parental coerciveness between boys and girls. It may be that a higher level of coerciveness is considered justified by boys than by girls. Girls therefore are less ready to respond to conditions which usually make coercive power more salient. That is to say, many girls may be highly coerced by a parent, but may not consider that coercive influence "legitimate" under most circumstances. Then they do not conform more to coercive influence even when punishment for noncompliance is highly probable. This interpretation is in agreement with findings of French, Levinger, and Morrison (1959) which showed greater "resistance" to coercive influence attempts which were perceived to be "illegitimate" than to those which were perceived to be "legitimate." Boys, finding relatively great coerciveness proper, conform to its influence under conditions of observability.

If girls do consider highly coercive influence from their parents to be illegitimate, this does not mean that they consider non-coercive types of influence to be illegitimate as well. Girls see this situation as one where the parents have a right to make these stipulations much more than boys do. This is evidenced in a general higher level of parental conformity for girls than boys. This difference occurs between sexes for each pair of conditions, and is "probably" significant in four instances; low mother coercion and low father coercion in the at-home conditions, and low and high father coercion in the not-home condition. Then, since the influence for girls

is generally appropriate, the high coercive groups have a high proportion of conformity, even though the extreme coercion is having no effect. The reward involved in conformity in the at-home, low coercive condition increases this already-high level of conformity. Boys are, on the other hand, responding to an influence which they are less likely to consider generally appropriate (being perhaps less inclined to think that their parents have the right to help them choose friends than girls are). Only the overt rewards and punishments of the at-home condition can increase their level of conformity.

These results can perhaps best be understood by considering them to be the product of five types of appropriateness, operating simultaneously in this situation:

1. The perceived right of parents to give advice, or interfere, in the choice of friends. According to the present interpretation, girls considered parents to have this right, while boys did not.

2. The perceived legitimacy of strong coercive influence from parents. This type of appropriateness, according to the present interpretation, is perceived for parents by boys but not by girls.

3. The perceived legitimacy of reward-based influence from parents. Both boys and girls consider parental reward legitimate.

4. The perceived probability that punishment can be given in the situation. This was the same for boys and girls, each having conditions of observability and unobservability, with high coerciveness.

5. The perceived probability that rewards can be given in the situation. This also was equivalent for boys and girls, each having conditions of observability and unobservability, with low coerciveness.

Because boys did not accept the parents' right to influence, they had a relatively low general level of conformity. Because they considered coercive and reward influence legitimate, they conformed more in the punishment-probable (parents at home, high coercion) than in the punishment-improbable (parents not home, high coercion) condition, and more in the reward-probable (parents at home, low coercion) than in the reward-improbable (parents not home, low coercion) condition.

Because girls did accept their parents' right to influence, they had a relatively high general level of conformity. Because they considered coercive influence illegitimate, but reward influence legitimate, they conformed no more in the punishment-probable than in the punishment-improbable condition, but more in the reward-probable than in the reward-improbable condition.

Summary

The study's major hypotheses were tested by a series of multiple regression analyses. Neither strength of relevance, power, or their product improved the prediction of the decision which could be obtained by using the direction of relevance alone. However, power and strength of relevance did show significant influence in some instances when the direction of relevance was held constant.

Variations were found in amount of influence between situations, guides, and sexes. These were interpreted as being due to the individual's perceptions of appropriateness.

Males were found to conform to their parents more when the parents could observe the behavior, irrespective of the degree of coerciveness of the parents. Females conformed more to their parents in the observable condition when the parents had a low degree of coerciveness, but not when they had a high degree of coerciveness.

CHAPTER VII

SUMMARY OF MAJOR RESULTS

The Theory and Its Test

In the present theory, the decision is held to be produced by the influence of behavior guides (parents, peers, impulses and values) on the adolescent making the decision. Three factors condition the influence exerted by each guide, power, relevance, and appropriateness. Power is a potentiality for influence to be effective, and is based on the individual's general internalized orientation toward accepting the guide's influence; an orientation which remains constant across situations. An act of relevance occurs when a guide exerts influence. The strength of relevance is a function of the strength of that act. The guide's appropriateness is the individual's perception that a given situation is a proper one for the guide to exert influence. The decision, by this theory, is produced by the product of power and strength of relevance of each guide in the situation, assuming a minimal level of appropriateness for each guide as well.

This theory was tested in a state-wide survey of Michigan high school students. Each respondent was given an "Inventory" which measured the power of each guide, as well as the respondent's need for independence and the coerciveness of his parents and peers. Each respondent was also interviewed. The

interview consisted of questions concerning a series of decision situations, some relating to actual decisions which the respondents had made, and some "hypothetical." Questions were asked the respondents concerning the decisions they would have made (for each hypothetical situation) or had made (for the "real" decision situations). The relevance of each guide was also ascertained for each situation through questions asked the respondents.

The theory was tested by means of a series of multiple regression analyses. Results of these analyses indicated that the direction of the act of relevance is the single most important determinant of the decision. Analyses done with power and with strength of relevance (either alone or combined) did not improve the predictions made using the direction of relevance alone. Because the direction was also involved in the power and strength of relevance analyses, the similar results between the analyses indicates that direction of relevance is responsible for the influence which is manifested. However, both power and strength of relevance demonstrated a relationship to the decision in some instances when the direction of relevance was held constant.

Power manifested a faint but consistent relationship with both direction and strength of relevance. It was thought that this relationship might in part explain the lack of differentiation between the different regression analyses. The measure of direction seemed to reflect power and strength of relevance also. The fact that the latter two show some influence when direction of relevance is controlled may indicate

that they do have some importance to the decision, but that this can only be observed under carefully controlled conditions.

Results of the study indicated that there may be two types of appropriateness; one determining when influence attempts are likely to be heard or admitted, the other determining when they are likely to be accepted or conformed to. The first type shows itself in the fact that guides exert differing amounts of influence in different situations; that is to say, their relevance varies from situation to situation. The second type was manifested in the regression analyses, where guides were seen to be differentially influential from situation to situation. The two types of variations did not always coincide. On some occasions a guide which was highly relevant obtained little conformity; on some a moderately relevant guide accounted for a relatively large proportion of the variance in the decision. If these variations are being produced by differences in appropriateness, it may be that this is one of the most important factors involved in decision-making.

Appropriateness seemed to be related to conformity to coercive influence in several different ways (see Chapter VI). Boys conformed more when the guide could observe their behavior, whether the guide was coercive or not. Girls conformed more when the guide could observe their behavior if he was slightly coercive, but not if he was highly coercive.

Determinants of the Independent Variables

Need for independence was found to be generally negatively related to parental relevance, particularly to father

relevance. It was proposed that this relationship may have two causes; generally highly relevant parents may habituate their children to depend on external sources for influence, while children of parents with low relevance learn through necessity to depend more on their own resources, and to request less advice from their parents. Parental coerciveness was positively related to parental relevance, particularly for males. It was assumed that parents who are coercive are those who wish to keep their children under relatively close control. They therefore give frequent advice (are highly relevant) as well as frequent and relatively severe punishment.

Coerciveness and need for independence were negatively correlated with the power scores, particularly those of the parents. These results were expected only with parental power; it was thought that the resentment caused by extreme coercion would result in reduced power for the parents, but an increased reliance on the power of the internal guides.

Most adolescents in this study received predominant punishment from the parent of the same sex. It was proposed that this punishment may be involved in the learning of sex role identifications, the parent of the same sex being the "teacher" and using punishment to reinforce this teaching. Results did not clearly support this notion. Need for independence and power scores were used as criteria of sex role identification. It was thought that a "good" identification for males would consist of a relatively high need for independence, high power for parents and values, and low power for peers and impulses. It was thought that females with "good" identification

would exhibit approximately the same power pattern, but a relatively low need for independence. Some data seemed to support these speculations while other data did not.

Females were found to have significantly greater power scores for all guides than did males. They also had more strongly relevant values than did males, and greater parental relevance in situations which seemed appropriate for parental protective concern. These differences were interpreted as being related to differences in the adolescent roles for males and females as well as in the adult roles being prepared for.

Some social class effects were also investigated. White-collar respondents had more powerful parents and values, and a weaker need for independence than did blue-collar respondents. There was very little difference in parental coerciveness between the two groups. Social class also produced some effect on the relevance of some guides in some situations, but by no means a general trend.

APPENDIX A

ESTIMATION OF SIGNIFICANCE LEVELS

Because the sample for the present study consists of a series of clusters, statistical tests based on simple random sampling assumptions are not applicable. Kish (1957) has discussed the errors in standard error estimation which can result from using simple random sampling formulas with clustered data.

Accordingly, formulas which compute standard errors on the basis of the cluster units used in the sample were applied in testing the significance of differences between means and between proportions. These formulas are presented in a recent article by Kish and Hess (1959, pp. 444-445).

This technique was applied to the difference between means in all cases in which the significance level as determined by t tests based on usual simple random sampling assumptions was between .05 and .01. Differences which did not reach the .05 level by this test were considered nonsignificant, while it was assumed that the majority of differences which were at better than the .01 level with the ordinary t test, would also attain the .05 level when clustering was accounted for. Throughout the study, therefore, differences between means which are called "significant," either reached the .05 level with the test accounting for clustering, or the .01 level with the test not accounting for clustering.

A modification of the cluster-based estimation was used in testing the differences between proportions, because the variances based on proportions are more generalizable than those based on means. The formulas accounting for clustering effects were applied to the differences between about thirty pairs of variables, selected to provide a wide range in base N's, and in the types of characteristics represented. Ratios of these standard errors to those computed on the simple random sampling basis were obtained. These ratios were plotted against the N's of the groups involved. General tables were prepared with two significant difference values for each comparison of two groups; a lower value based on the standard error formula for simple random samples, and an upper value which is the product of the lower value and a constant derived from the maximums of the ratios of the two types of standard errors which were computed. Because the values provided in these tables are generalized approximations, the applications to individual cases cannot be considered precisely accurate. The actual standard errors for individual cases usually lie in the range delimited by the simple random sampling estimations for the lower bound, and the clustered sample estimations for the upper bound. Throughout the study, differences which reach significance according to the clustered estimation values are differentiated from those which reach it according to the simple random sampling estimation values. The former differences are considered "probably" significant; the latter, "possibly" significant.

Because formulas for computing the cluster sample

variances for analytic statistics have not been developed, the following technique (which is suggested by Kish, 1957, p. 164) was used to estimate the departure from the "true" values of the estimated variances for the multiple correlations, zero-order correlations, and regression coefficients used in the present study. The variances were computed for these statistics for forty randomly-selected halves of the total sample in a multiple regression analysis for three of the situations used in that analysis. The three regression analyses which were selected were intended to be representative. They used three different types of conditioning factors on the independent variables, both hypothetical and real situations, and had very different multiple correlations from one another. The mean variances obtained from these computations were compared with those using a single simple random sampling estimation. For each type of statistic, the variance was usually greater as computed by the forty half-sample technique than by the simple random sampling technique. Therefore the variances obtained with the S.R.S. formulas for each of these statistics were multiplied by values near the upper limit of the obtained ratio range. Similarly to the proportions, the two values are considered to delimit a range within which most actual variances lie. Consequently, the same convention is used for these, and both types of significance results are presented, throughout the study. Values which reach significance by the forty half-sample estimation are considered "probably" significant, and those which only reach it by the S.R.S. estimation, "possibly" significant.

APPENDIX B

SUPPLEMENTARY TABLE

TABLE 24

MOST FREQUENT REASONS, BY SITUATION* AND SEX

Real Situations	Responses to Impulse Questions	N	%	Responses to Value Questions	N	%
	"Why did you feel like doing that?"			"Why was that the right thing to do?"		
After High School	Boys			Boys		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	149	34	To be better prepared for future	149	11
	To be better prepared for future	149	18			
	Girls					
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	209	33			
	To be better prepared for future	209	12			
High School Course	Boys			Boys		
	To be better prepared for future	125	46	To be better prepared for future	125	27
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	125	17			
	Girls			Girls		
	To be better prepared for future	179	41	To be better prepared for future	179	17
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	179	23			

*All responses given by 10 per cent or more of the boys or girls are presented for each situation. Percentages are based on the total sample for the hypothetical situations, and on the total of those who "had to make" the real decisions.

TABLE 24--Continued

Real Situations	Responses to Impulse Questions	N	%	Responses to Value Questions	N	%
	"Why did you feel like doing that?"			"Why was that the right thing to do?"		
Joining Club	Boys					
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	110	45			
	Girls			Girls		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	163	45	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	163	10
	Desire to be with friends	163	10			
Getting Job	Boys					
	Making money (or working) because need or want it	143	43			
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	143	17			
	Girls					
	Making money (or working) because need or want it	155	28			
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	155	22			
Going Steady	Boys			Boys		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	91	53	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	91	17
	Avoidance of being tied down, restricted to one girl friend	91	11			
	Girls			Girls		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	158	51	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	158	18
	Avoidance of being tied down, restricted to one boy friend	158	15			

TABLE 24--Continued

Real Situations	Responses to Impulse Questions	N	%	Responses to Value Questions	N	%
	"Why did you feel like doing that?"			"Why was that the right thing to do?"		
Breaking Friendship	Boys			Boys		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	97	21	Keep on the moral path, avoid evil, bad ways, etc..	97	18
	Keep on the moral path, avoid evil, bad ways, etc..	97	10			
	Girls			Girls		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	149	23	Self protection against bad reputation, spread of rumor, etc.. . . .	149	10
	Self protection against bad reputation, etc. . .	149	11			
Hypothetical Situations	"Why would you feel like doing that?"			"Why would that be the right thing to do?"		
Rumor	Boys			Boys		
	Self protection against bad reputation, spread of rumor, etc.	153	20	Desire to make friends, keep friends, act friendly	153	19
	Finding out truth, not acting on unverified evidence	153	20	Finding out truth, not acting on unverified evidence	153	18
	Girls			Girls		
	Finding out truth, not acting on unverfied evidence.	213	25	Finding out truth, not acting on unverified evidence.	213	22
	Self protection against bad reputation, spread of rumor, etc..	213	17	Desire to make friends, keep friends, act friendly	213	10
	Desire to keep groups compatible.	213	10			

TABLE 24--Continued

Hypothetical Situations	Responses to Impulse Questions	N	%	Responses to Value Questions	N	%
	"Why would you feel like doing that?"			"Why would that be the right thing to do?		
Copying	Boys			Boys		
	Desire not to be exploited. .	153	14	Honesty.	153	22
	Cheating is bad for the cheater	153	14	People should learn for themselves, not depend on others . .	153	16
	One should be helpful to others, protect others. . .	153	12	Cheating is bad for the cheater.	153	20
	It is wrong to interfere with others, make trouble	153	12	Desire not to be exploited.	153	10
	Honesty	153	11			
	Girls			Girls		
	People should learn for themselves, not depend on others.	213	18	Honesty.	213	32
	Cheating is bad for the cheater	213	15	Cheating is bad for the cheater.	213	21
	Honesty	213	15	People should learn for themselves, not depend on others . . .	213	14
	One should be helpful to others, protect others. . .	213	12			
	Desire not to be exploited. .	213	10			
Friend's Home	Boys			Boys		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	153	22	It is right, proper, to follow advice of parents.	153	43
	Desire to be with friends . .	153	11	It is wise to follow advice of parents .	153	18

TABLE 24--Continued

Hypothetical Situations	Responses to Impulse Questions	N	%	Responses to Value Questions	N	%
	"Why would you feel like doing that?"			"Why would that be the right thing to do?"		
Friend's Home	Girls			Girls		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	213	26	It is right, proper, to follow advice of parents	213	43
	Finding out truth, not acting on unverified evidence	213	13	It is wise to follow advice of parents . . .	213	17
Stay-Go	Boys			Boys		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	154	61	It is right, proper, to follow advice of parents	154	46
				Concern for parents' feelings, welfare . . .	154	21
	Girls			Girls		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to.	212	54	It is right, proper, to follow advice of parents	212	46
				Concern for parents' feelings, welfare . . .	212	10
				One should live up to parents' trust.	212	10
Party-Aunt	Boys			Boys		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	151	64	One should meet family obligations	151	26
	Desire to be with friends .	151	30	Keeping one's promises	151	22
	Girls			Girls		
	Fun, like it, exciting, want to	212	49	Keeping one's promises. .	212	26
	Desire to be with friends .	212	30	One should meet family obligations	212	25
				It is right, proper, to follow advice of parents	212	13

APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENTS

Name _____ Date _____

Age _____ School _____

Grade _____ Sex _____

INVENTORY

Put a check on the scale next to every word or phrase in the following lists, at the point which best describes your feeling. Make a separate judgment for each item, and don't consider what you have already said on the other items. Go as quickly as you can.

I. Fill this out for your father. If you are not living with your father but you are living with a step father, foster father, etc. fill this out for him. Otherwise, leave this blank and go on to list II on the third page.

Generally what my father tells me to do is:

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
the best to follow	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
often silly	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
for my own good	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	Strongly disagree
no fun	Strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
best in the long run	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
stupid	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
right	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
unwise	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
sometimes idiotic	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
very good	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree
just the right thing	strongly agree	_	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	: _	strongly disagree

Generally what my father tells me to do is:

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
helpful	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
likely to get me into trouble	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
too tame	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
the best	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very nice	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes wrong	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
a pain in the neck	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
fun to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes bad	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
not very important	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
impossible to follow, sometimes	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
usually a good thing to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

II. Fill this out for your own personal desires. By personal desires we mean what you, yourself just feel like doing.

Generally what my personal desires tell me is:

the best to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
often silly	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
for my own good	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
no fun	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
best in the long run	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
stupid	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
right	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
unwise	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
sometimes idiotic	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
very good	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
just the right thing	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
helpful	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
likely to get me into trouble	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
too tame	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
the best	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
very nice	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
sometimes wrong	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
a pain in the neck	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
fun to follow	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
sometimes bad	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree
not very important	strongly agree	_	_	_	_	_	_	strongly disagree

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
impossible to follow, sometimes	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
usually a good thing to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

III. Fill this out for your mother. If you are not living with your mother but you are living with a step mother, foster mother, etc., fill this out for her. Otherwise leave it blank and go on to list IV.

Generally what my mother tells me to do is:

the best to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
often silly	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
for my own good	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
no fun	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
best in the long run	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
stupid	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
right	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
unwise	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes idiotic	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very good	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
just the right thing	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
helpful	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
likely to get me into trouble	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
too tame	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
the best	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very nice	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes wrong	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
a pain in the neck	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
fun to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes bad	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
not very important	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
impossible to follow, sometimes	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
usually a good thing to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

IV. Fill this out for your friends. By friends we mean: the small group of your closest friends with whom you spend a lot of your time.

Generally what my friends tell me to do is:

the best to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
often silly	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
for my own good	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
no fun	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
best in the long run	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
stupid	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
right	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
unwise	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes idiotic	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very good	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
just the right thing	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
helpful	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
likely to get me into trouble	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
too tame	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
the best	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very nice	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes wrong	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
a pain in the neck	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
fun to follow	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes bad	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
not very important	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
impossible to follow, sometimes	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
usually a good thing to follow	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

V. Fill this out for your conscience. By conscience we mean: what you feel is morally right, what you <u>ought</u> to do.

<u>Generally what my conscience tells me to do is</u>:

the best to follow	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
often silly	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
for my own good	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
no fun	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
best in the long run	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
stupid	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
right	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
unwise	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes idiotic	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very good	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
just the right thing	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
helpful	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
likely to get me into trouble	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
too tame	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
the best	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
very nice	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes wrong	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
a pain in the neck	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
fun to follow	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
sometimes bad	strongly agree __:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

		1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
not very important	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
impossible to follow, sometimes	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree
usually a good thing to follow	strongly agree	__:__:__:__:__:__:__	strongly disagree

Put a check in what you feel to be the spot which best describes your judgment for each sentence.

If I do something which my father has told me not to do:

	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
he hits or slaps me					
he takes away some privilege (use of car, reduction in allowance, etc.)					
he yells at me					
he beats me					
he punishes me in some way					
he scolds me					

If I do something my friends don't like:

	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
they do something to me which I don't like					
they avoid me					
they hit or slap me					
they beat me up					
they get mad and tell me so					
they yell at me					

If I do something which my mother has told me not to do:

	always	usually	sometimes	rarely	never
she hits or slaps me					
she takes away some privilege (use of car, reduction in allowance, etc.)					
she yells at me					
she beats me					
she punishes me in some way					
she scolds me					

PREFERENCES INVENTORY

Please check your answers on the scales below each of the following questions.

1. How important is it for you to feel that you can run your life without depending upon people who are older and more experienced than you?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

2. How much would you like, or do you like, being free from all family control?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

3. How much does it bother you when you have to treat people who have a higher status than yours as if they were better than you?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

4. How important do you think it is for the leaders of a country to be strong and forceful?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

5. When you are in the presence of persons who have achieved a high position, how much do you think you should control your own wishes and try to act in accordance with the wishes of these persons?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

6. How much do you like people who are forceful and dominant?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

7. How much do you think that the leaders of organizations to which you belong have the right to expect certain things from you to which you should conform?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all slightly somewhat very extremely

8. Do you think for a truly happy marriage that in major issues the husband should tell the wife what to do? (select one)

___ 1. In most major issues
___ 2. In some major issues
___ 3. In only a few major issues
___ 4. In only a very few major issues
___ 5. Never

9. How much do you usually want the person who is in charge of a group you are in to tell you what to do?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____

Not at all | a little | somewhat | quite a bit | very much

10. How often do you like to base your actions on <u>your own</u> judgments and evaluations?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____

Rarely | Sometimes | Often | Very often | Almost Always

11. How much do you feel that you are not as good in most things as people who are older and more experienced than you?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____

Not at all | a little | somewhat | quite a bit | very much

12. Under which of these conditions would you learn best? (select one)

_____ 1. If I were left completely alone to seek out whatever I wanted.
_____ 2. If I were given suggestions from teachers as to what might be best to study.
_____ 3. If I were given some suggestions and some assignments to complete.
_____ 4. If I were instructed, given assignments, and tested occasionally.
_____ 5. If I were given daily instructions, daily assignments, and frequent tests.

13. Do you feel that people who have reached high office in the government have a right to feel that they are better than most people? (select one)

_____ 1. Yes, they have very much of a right.
_____ 2. Yes, they have fairly much of a right.

_____ 3. Yes, they have some right.
_____ 4. Yes, they have a little right.
_____ 5. No, they have no right at all.

14. How much do you feel that officers of the law should tell people what to do rather than ask them?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all a little somewhat quite a bit very much

15. In school how much do you <u>dislike</u> teachers who have forceful and dominant personalities?

:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____:_____
Not at all a little somewhat quite a bit very much

University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Study G-75
April 1958

Face Sheet

Interview Schedule for Decision-Making Study

Interviewer's Name _____ Int. Number ___

Date of Interview _____ Time taken for interview ___ mins.

County (or Metro Area) _____

Town or City (if applicable) _____

Name of School _____

RESPONDENT'S

Name _____ Sex _____

Age _____ Grade _____
(Grade R is now in)

Date of Birth _____
Day Month Year

Race White ___ Negro ___ Other _____

Do you live with your mother and father? ___ yes ___ no

(IF NO) Are your parents divorced or separated? __ yes __no

(IF R LIVES WITH NEITHER PARENT)
Do you live with some other adult(s)? _____ Who? _____

What is their relation to you? _____

I am going to be asking you about decisions today. When I say a decision, I mean when you see several different things you might do, and you are trying to make up your mind which one to do. Sometimes decisions are fairly easy to make, and you don't have to think about them much before you make them, but others are more difficult and you think about them a lot and ask other people what they think before deciding. We will be talking about both kinds. Lets start off with an imaginary one.

(SHOW R. PICTURE, IF R, IS A BOY SHOW PICTURE OF BOY, IF R. IS A GIRL, SHOW PICTURE OF GIRL)

1. This is a picture of a boy (girl) who is trying to make a decision. I want you to make up a story, just the first thing that comes to your mind, about what the decision is, what he (she) does to help make up his (her) mind, and what he (she) finally decides.

   1a. What is the decision he (she) is trying to make
   (TRY TO GET SPECIFIC STORY)

   1b. What are the things he (she) might do?

   1c. What does he (she) decide?

   1d. Why does he (she) decide that?
   (TRY TO GET AT SPECIFIC REASONS)

2. Have you decided what to do when you finish high school?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 3)

(IF YES)

   2a. What have you decided to do?

   2b. When did you decide to do that?

   2c. Was this an easy or a hard decision for you to make?

   2d. How did you go about making it?

   2e. What kinds of things did you take into account?

2f. Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

2g. What was her opinion?

2h. Did you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

2i. What was his opinion?

2j. Did you talk to your close friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

2k. What were their opinions?

2m. Sometimes people feel two ways about what they should do. They really <u>feel</u> like doing one thing, and think they <u>ought</u> to do another. Did you have this kind of problem with this decision?

2n. Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES)

2o. What was it?

2p. Why did you want to do that?

2q. Did your conscience tell you whether one thing was better than another?

(IF YES)

2r. Which was better?

2s. Why was that better?

(IF NO TO QUESTION 2)

3. Are you trying to decide right now?

(IF NO SKIP TO QUESTION 4)

(IF YES)

3a. Is this an easy or a hard decision for you to make?

3b. How have you been going about trying to make it?

3c. What kinds of things have you been considering?

3d. Have you talked to your mother about it, or thought about her opinion?

(IF YES)

3e. What is her opinion?

3f. Have you talked to your father about it, or thought about his opinion?

(IF YES)

3g. What is his opinion?

3h. Have you talked to your close friends about it, or thought about their opinions?

(IF YES)

3i. What are their opinions?

3j. Sometimes people feel two ways about what they should do. They really <u>feel</u> like doing one thing, and think they <u>ought</u> to do another. Are you having this kind of problem with this decision?

3k. Have you considered what you personally just feel like doing?

(IF YES)

3m. What is it?

3n. Why do you feel like doing that?

3o. Has your conscience told you whether one thing is better than another?

(IF YES)

3p. Which is better?

3q. Why is that better?

---

4. I'm going to be asking you about your friends in some of these questions? Whenever I say 'your friends,' I mean the people you consider your best friends and spend a lot of time with.

Now, suppose that some of your friends suddenly decide to have a party and ask you to come, on an evening when you had promised your parents you would go with them to visit an aunt, and your aunt expects you.

4a. What would you do?

4b. What would your father want you to do?

(AFTER ANSWER TO 4b, GIVE R, SCALE CARDS A AND B)

4c. You can hold these cards since you'll be using them for the rest of the interview. Look at Card A and tell me how sure you are of that? _____

4d. Look at card B and tell me how strongly you think he would feel about it? _____

4e. What would your mother want you to do?

4f. Look at card A and tell me how sure you are of that? _____

4g. Look at card B and tell me how strongly you think she would feel about it? _____

4h. How strongly would your friends want you to come to the party, on card B? _____

(IF QUESTIONS 2 AND 3 WERE ASKED, SKIP TO QUESTION 4j; IF 2 AND 3 WERE OMITTED, MAKE STATEMENT 4i BEFORE ASKING QUESTION 4j)

4i. Sometimes people feel two ways about what they should do. They really <u>feel</u> like doing one thing and think they <u>ought</u> to do another.

4j. Would there be any difference between what you would <u>feel</u> like doing and what you would think you <u>ought</u> to do in this situation?

4k. What would you personally just feel like doing?

4m. How sure are you, on card A? _____

4n. How strongly would you feel like doing that, on card B? _____

4o. Why would you feel like doing that?

4p. What would your conscience tell you was the right thing to do?

4q. How sure are you of that, on card A? _____

4r. How strongly would you feel you ought to act that way, on card B? _____

4s. Why would you feel that was the right thing to do?

5. Have you ever gone steady?

(IF NO, SKIP TO 5b)

(IF YES)

5a. Are you going steady now?

ASK ONLY IF NO TO 5)

5b. Have you ever had to decide whether to go steady or not?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 6)

(IF YES TO 5, 5a, or 5b)

5c. When did you decide whether to go steady or not?

5d. Was this an easy or a hard decision for you?

5e. How did you go about making the decision?

5f. What kinds of things did you consider?

5g. Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

5h. What was her opinion?

5i. Did you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

5j. What was his opinion?

5k. Did you talk to your friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

5m. What were their opinions?

5n. Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES)

5o. What was it?

5p. Why did you feel like doing that?

5q. Did your conscience tell you what was the right thing to do?

(IF YES)

5r. What was it?

5s. Why did you feel that was the right thing to do?

(QUESTION 6 HAS TWO FORMS: A AND B-IN THE FIRST INTERVIEW YOU TAKE, USE FORM A, ON THE SECOND ONE YOU TAKE, USE FORM B. - CONTINUE TO ALTERNATE ALL THE WAY THROUGH. IF YOUR LAST INTERVIEW ONE DAY IS FORM A, START THE NEXT MORNING WITH FORM B, ETC.)

FORM A 6. Suppose you are at a friend's house, talking and having a good time with a group of close boy (girl) [same sex as R] friends, one evening. It is getting later and later. You know your parents are home, and that they told you to be home by a certain time. Your friends try to persuade you to stay since everyone is having a good time.

FORM B 6. Suppose you are at a friend's house, talking and having a good time with a group of close boy (girl) [same sex as R] friends, one evening. It is getting later and later. You know your parents are not home and that they will never know what time you return. You also know, however, that they told you to be home at a certain time. Your friends try to persuade you to stay since everyone is having a good time.

(THE FOLLOWING: 6a - 6k ARE TO BE ASKED FOLLOWING 6, WHICHEVER FORM WAS USED)

6a. Do you stay or go?

(FROM NOW ON, IT WILL PROBABLY NOT BE NECESSARY TO TELL THE R, WHICH CARD YOU WANT HIM TO USE FOR THE SURENESS AND STRENGTH QUESTIONS, SO NOTHING IS SPECIFICALLY SAID IN THE QUESTIONS. IF THE R. DOESN'T SEEM TO GET THE IDEA, JUST GO ON TELLING HIM WHICH CARD YOU WANT HIM TO USE)

6b. How strongly would your parents want you to go home? (CARD B) _____

6c. How strongly would your friends want you to stay? (CARD B) _____

6d. What would you personally just feel like doing?

6e. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

6f. How strongly would you feel like doing that? (CARD B) _____

6g. Why would you feel like doing that?

6h. What would your conscience tell you was the right thing to do?

6i. How sure are you of that (CARD A) _____

6j. How strongly would you feel that you ought to act that way? (CARD B) _____

6k. Why would you feel that was the right thing to do?

(IF R. IS A BOY, ASK QUESTION ABOUT BOYS, IF GIRL, ABOUT GIRLS)

7. Have you ever broken off a friendship with a boy (girl) friend?

(IF NO, ASK QUESTION 7a. ABOUT A FRIEND OF THE OPPOSITE SEX)

7a. Have you ever broken off a friendship with a boy (girl) friend?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 8)

(IF YES to 7 or 7a)

7c. When did it happen?

7d. Was it an easy or a hard decision for you?

7e. How did you go about making the decision?

7f. What kinds of things did you consider?

7g. Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

7h. What was her opinion?

7i. Did you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

7j. What was his opinion?

7k. Did you talk to your friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

7m. What were their opinions?

7n. Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES)

7o. What was it?

7p. Why did you feel like doing that?

7q. Did your conscience tell you what was the right thing to do?

(IF YES)

7r. What was it?

7s. Why did you feel that was the right thing to do?

8. Suppose you are taking a test and a classmate of yours whom you know slightly starts copying from your paper. Would you let him or not?

(IF "DEPENDS," ON WHAT WOULD IT DEPEND?)

8a. What would your father want you to do?

8b. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

8c. How strongly would he feel about it? (CARD B) _____

8d. What would your mother want you to do?

8e. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

8f. How strongly would she feel about it? (CARD B) _____

8g. What would your close friends want you to do?

8h. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

8i. How strongly would they feel about it? (CARD B) _____

8j. What would you personally just feel like doing?

8k. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

8m. How strongly would you feel like doing that? (CARD B) _____

8n. Why would you feel like doing that?

8o. What would your conscience tell you was the right thing to do?

8p. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

8q. How strongly would you feel you ought to act that way? (CARD B) _____

8r. Why would you feel that was the right thing to do?

9. Do you have a job?

(IF NO)

9a.. Have you had one in the last few years?

(IF NO)

9b. Have you had to decide whether or not to get a job at any time during the last few years?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 10)

(IF YES, TO 9, 9a or 9b)

9c. When did you make the decision whether to take the job?

9d. Was it an easy or a hard decision for you?

9e. How did you go about making it?

9f. What kinds of things did you consider?

9g. Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

9h. What was her opinion?

9i. Did you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

9j. What was his opinion?

9k. Did you talk to your close friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

9m. What were their opinions?

9n. Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES)

9o. What was it?

9p. Why did you feel like doing that?

9q. Did your conscience tell you whether one thing was better than another?

(IF YES)

9r. Which was better?

9s. Why was that better?

10. Suppose that you have met a boy (girl [same sex as R] your own age whom you and your friends like very much. You bring him (her) home with you one afternoon. Your parents meet him (her) and seem to take a disliking to him (her). After he (she) leaves they tell you not to see him (her) again, he is a 'bad influence,' etc. They seem to feel fairly strongly about this. You see him (her) in school the next day, and he (she) invites you to his (her) house.

10a. What do you do?

10b. What would your close friends think you should do?

10c. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

10d. How strongly would they feel about it? (CARD B) _____

10e. What would you personally just feel like doing?

10f. Why would you feel like doing that?

10g. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

10h. How strongly would you feel like doing that? (CARD B) _____

10i. What would your conscience tell you was the right thing to do?

10j. How sure are you of that? (CARD A) _____

10k. How strongly would you feel you ought to act that way? (CARD B) _____

10m. Why would you feel that was the right thing to do?

10n. Would you see any other things to do in this situation?

(IF YES)

10o. What are they?

10p. What would probably happen if you went?

10q. What would probably happen if you didn't go?

11. Have you joined any clubs within the last few years?

(IF YES, SKIP TO 11b)

(IF NO)

11a. Have you had to decide whether to join a club or not at any time in the last few years?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 12)

(IF YES)

11b. What kind of club is (was) it?

11c. What is the name of it?

11d. When did you decide whether or not to join the most recent club?

11e. Was deciding whether or not to join an easy or a hard decision for you?

11f. How did you go about making it?

11g. What kinds of things did you consider?

11h. Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

11i. What was her opinion?

11j. Did you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

11k. What was his opinion?

11m. Did you talk to your close friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

11n. What were their opinions?

11o. Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES) _____

11p. What was it?

11q. Why did you feel like doing that?

_____

11r. Did your conscience tell you what was the right thing to do?

(IF YES) _____

11s. What was it?

11t. Why did you feel that was the right thing to do?

_____

(ON QUESTION 12, GIVE FORM A TO BOYS AND FORM B TO GIRLS)

FORM A BOYS Imagine that a close friend of yours has told you that he is very interested in a new girl with whom

he has already gone out a few times. He introduces you to her one evening and immediately you like her very much. You feel very strongly that you would like to ask her out. A few days later you mention this to your friend. He tells you he would really rather you didn't ask her out. You speak to your parents about it. Your mother feels very strongly that you should ask the girl and let her decide. Your father doesn't have such a strong feeling about the matter. However, he says that the best thing would probably be not to call the girl. Most of your other close friends give you approximately the same advice as your father, but they feel it somewhat more strongly. Your conscience tells you without a bit of doubt that you should not call her. You don't want to lose the friendship of your friend, but on the other hand, what if she should turn out to be the 'right girl' for you? Which would you do, ask her out or not?

12a. Do you see any other ways you might solve the problem?

(IF YES)

12b. What?

12c. What would probably happen if you asked her out?

12d. What would probably happen if you didn't ask her out?

FORM B
GIRLS

Imagine that a close friend of yours has told you that she is very interested in a new boy with whom she has already gone out a few times. She introduces you to him one evening and immediately you like him very much. You feel very strongly that you would like to go out with him. A few days later you mention this to your friend. She tells you she would feel badly if he went out with another girl, even you. You meet the boy in a drug store once and talk to him for a while. You are sure he likes you too, and you think he is going to call you soon. You speak to your parents about it. Your mother feels very strongly that if he asks you, you should go out with him. Your father doesn't have such a strong feeling about the matter. However, he says that the best thing would probably be not to go out with him. Most of your close friends give you approximately the same advice as your father, but they feel it somewhat more strongly. Your conscience tells you without a bit of doubt that you should not go out with him. You don't want to lose the friendship of your friend, but on the other hand, what if he should turn out to be the 'right

boy' for you? One evening he calls you up for a date. Do you go out with him or not?

12a. Do you see any other ways you might solve the problem?

(IF YES)

12b. What?

12c. What would probably happen if you went out with him?

12d. What would probably happen if you wouldn't go out with him?

13. Suppose that someone tells you that a person whom you considered as a fairly close friend has been saying bad things about you behind your back. Then, one day you see the friend walking on the street. He (she) [same sex as R.] smiles and says hello.

13a. What do you do?

13b. How would you go about deciding how to act toward this person?

13c. What kinds of things would you consider?

13d. Would you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

13e. What would her opinion be?

13f. Would you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

13g. What would his opinion be?

13h. Would you talk to your other close friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

13i. What would their opinions be?

13j. Would you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES)

13k. What would that be?

13m. Why would you feel like doing that?

13n. Would your conscience tell you what was the right thing to do?

(IF YES)

13o. What would that be?

13p. Why would that be the right thing to do?

13q. What other things might you do?

14. Did you, or do you have to choose between taking a college preparatory course and a general, commercial, or some other course in high school?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 15)

(IF YES)

14a. Have you decided yet?

(IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 15)

(IF YES)

14b. When did you decide?

14c. What did you decide?

14d. Was this an easy or a hard decision for you to make?

14e. How did you go about making it?

14f. What kinds of things did you consider?

14g. Did you talk to your mother about it, or think about her opinion?

(IF YES)

14h. What was her opinion?

14i. Did you talk to your father about it, or think about his opinion?

(IF YES)

14j. What was his opinion?

14k. Did you talk to your close friends about it, or think about their opinions?

(IF YES)

14m. What were their opinions?

14n. Did you consider what you personally just felt like doing?

(IF YES)

14o. What was it?

14p. Why did you feel like doing that?

14q. Did your conscience tell you what was the right thing to do?

(IF YES)

14r. What was it?

14s. Why did you feel that was the right thing to do?

(IF NO TO 14a)

15. Are you trying to decide now?

(IF NO, SKIP TO PERSONAL DATA)

(IF YES)

15a. Which courses are you trying to decide between?

15b. Is this the easy or the hard kind of decision for you?

15c. How have you been going about making it?

15d. What kinds of things have you been considering?

15e. Have you talked to your mother about it, or thought about her opinion?

(IF YES)

15f. What is her opinion?

15g. Have you talked to your father about it, or thought about his opinion?

(IF YES)

15h. What is his opinion?

15i. Have you talked to your close friends about it, or thought about their opinions?

(IF YES)

15j. What are their opinions?

15k. Have you considered what you personally just feel like doing?

(IF YES)

15m. What is it?

15n. Why do you feel like doing that?

15o. Has your conscience told you what is the right thing to do?

(IF YES)

15p. What is it?

15q. Why do you feel that is the right thing to do?

PERSONAL DATA

1. What kind of work does your father do? Could you describe what he does on the job?

_____

_____

1a. Does he work for himself or for someone else? _____

1b. (IF OUT OF WORK) What does he usually do? _____

_____

1c. Does your mother work?

___ Full-time ___ Part-time ___ Not at all

1d. (IF MOTHER WORKS) What does she do? _____

_____

3. How often do your parents go to religious services?

___ Regularly ___ Often ___ Seldom ___ Never

4. How often do you go to religious services or classes?

___ Regularly ___ Often ___ Seldom ___ Never

5. How long have you lived here in (city or town)? _____

(IF LESS THAN 5 YEARS)

5a. About how many times have you moved since you were 10 years old? _____

6. Do you have any brothers and sisters ___ yes ___ no

7. (SPECIFY SEX AND AGE OF EACH)

8. Does your family have?

Their own house	___ yes	___ no
A vacuum cleaner?	___ yes	___ no
An electric or gas refrigerator?	___ yes	___ no
A bathtub or shower?	___ yes	___ no
A telephone?	___ yes	___ no
An automobile?	___ yes	___ no

9. Have you had paid lessons in dancing, dramatics, speech, art, music, etc. outside of school? ___ yes ___ no.

10. About how far did your father go in school? _____

11. How much schooling did your mother have? _____

REFERENCES

ADORNO, T.W., FRENKEL-BRUNSWIK, E., LEVINSON, D.J., AND SANFORD, R.N. The Authoritarian Personality. New York: Harper, 1950.

ALTUCHER, N. "Conflict in Sex Identification in Boys." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1956.

ASCH, S.E. Effects of group pressure upon the modification and distortion of judgements. In Guetzkow, H. (ed.) Groups, Leadership and Men. Pittsburgh: Carnegie Press, 1951.

ATKINSON, J.W. Motivational determinants of risk-taking behavior. Psychol. Rev., 1957, 64, 359-372.

AUSUBEL, D.P. Theory and Problems of Adolescent Development. New York: Grune and Stratton, 1954.

BANDURA, A., AND WALTERS, R.H. Dependency conflicts in aggressive adolescents. J. soc. Issues, 1958, 14, 52-65.

BELL, E.C. "Inner-directed and Other-directed Attitudes." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, Yale University, 1955.

BENEDICT, R.F. Continuities and discontinuities in cultural conditioning. Psychiatry, 1938, 1, 161-167.

BRODBECK, A.J. Learning theory and identification: IV. Oedipal motivation as a determinant of conscience development. J. genet. Psychol., 1954, 84, 219-227.

BRONFENBRENNER, U. Socialization and social class through time and space. In Maccoby, E.E., Newcomb, T.M., and Hartley, E.L. (eds.), Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt, 1958a.

BRONFENBRENNER, U. "Some familial antecedents of responsibility and leadership in adolescents." Unpublished paper, 1958b.

BRONFENBRENNER, U. The study of identification through interpersonal perception. In Tagiuri, R., and Petrullo, L. (eds.) Person Perception and Interpersonal Behavior. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1958c.

CARTWRIGHT, D. A field theoretical conception of power. In Cartwright, D. (ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

CRUTCHFIELD, R.S. Conformity and character. Amer. Psychologist, 1955, 10, 191-198.

DAVIS, A. Socialization and adolescent personality. Yearb. nat. Soc. Stud. Educ., 1944, 43 (2), 198-216.

DAVIS, A., AND HAVIGHURST, R.J. Social class and color differences in child-rearing. In Swanson, G.E., Newcomb, T.M., and Hartley, E.L. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt, 1952.

DONVAN, E., AND KANE, C. Adolescent Girls. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1958.

ERICSON, M.C. Child rearing and social status. Amer. J. Sociol., 1946, 52, 190-192.

FENICHEL, O. The Psychoanalytic Theory of Neurosis. New York: Norton, 1945.

FESTINGER, L., AND THIBAUT, J. Interpersonal communication in small groups. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1951, 46, 92-99.

FRENCH, J.R.P., JR., LEVINGER, G., AND MORRISON, H.W. The legitimacy of coercive power. Submitted to J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1959.

FRENCH, J.R.P., JR., AND RAVEN, B. The bases of social power. In Cartwright, D. (ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

FRENCH, J.R.P., JR., AND SNYDER, R. Leadership and interpersonal power. In Cartwright, D. (ed.), Studies in Social Power. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research, 1959.

FREUD, A. The Ego and the Mechanisms of Defense. New York: Int. Univ. Press, 1947.

FREUD, S. Civilization and Its Discontents. London: Hogarth, 1930.

FREUD, S. Group Psychology and the Analysis of the Ego. London: Liveright, 1949.

FREUD, S. New Introductory Lectures on Psychoanalysis. New York: Norton, 1933.

FREUD, S. The Ego and the Id. London: Hogarth, 1927.

GERARD, H.B. The effect of different dimensions of disagreement on the communication process in small groups. Hum. Relat., 1953, 6, 249-272.

HANKINS, D. The psychology and direct treatment of adolescents. Ment. Hyg., 1943, 27, 238-247.

HELPER, M.M. Learning theory and the self-concept. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 51, 184-194.

HELSON, H. An experimental approach to personality. Psychiat. Res. Rep., 1955, 2, 89-99.

HELSON, H., BLAKE, R.R., MOUTON, J.S., AND OLMSTEAD, J.A. Attitudes as adjustments to stimulus background and residual factors. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 314-322.

HENRY, A.F. Family role structure and self blame. Soc. Forces, 1956, 35, 34-38.

KALLEN, D.J. "Character Structure, Social Structure and Decision Behavior." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1957.

KELMAN, H.C. "Compliance, identification and internalization." Draft of monograph, 1956.

KELMAN, H.C. Effects of success and failure on "suggestibility" in the autokinetic situation. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1950, 45, 267-285.

KING, S.H., AND HENRY, A.F. Aggression and cardio-vascular reactions related to parental control over behavior. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1955, 50, 206-210.

KISH, L. Confidence intervals for clustered samples. Amer. Sociol. Rev., 1957, 22, 154-165.

KISH, L., AND FESS, I. On variances of ratios and their differences in multi-stage samples. J. Amer. stat. Assoc., 1959, 54, 416-446.

KOMAROVSKY, M. Cultural contradictions and sex roles. In Landis, J.T., and Landis, M.G. (eds.), Readings in Marriage and the Family. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1952.

LEWIN, K. Field Theory in Social Science. New York: Harper, 1951.

LEWIN, K. The conceptual representation and measurement of psychological forces. Contr. Psychol. Theor., 1938, 1, No. 4.

LIPPITT, R., AND HOFFMAN, L.W. Parental coerciveness, child autonomy and child's role at school. Submitted to Sociometry, 1959.

LIPPITT, R., LOLANSKY, N., REDL, F., AND ROSEN, S. The dynamics of power. In Swanson, G.E., Newcomb, T.M., and Hartley, E.L. Readings in Social Psychology. New York: Henry Holt, 1952.

LUCE, R.D., AND RAIFFA, H. Games and Decisions: Introduction and Critical Survey. New York: John Wiley, 1957.

LYNN, D.B. A note on sex differences in the development of masculine and feminine identifications. Psychol. Rev., 1959, 66, 126-135.

MAAS, H.S. The role of member in clubs of lower-class and middle-class adolescents. Child. Dev., 1954, 25, 241-251.

MAUSNER, B. Studies in social interaction: III. Effect of variation in one partner's prestige on the interaction of observer pairs. J. appl. Psychol., 1953, 37, 391-393.

MICHIGAN EDUCATION DIRECTORY AND BUYER'S GUIDE, 1957-1958. Lansing: Michigan Education Directory, 1957.

MINKOWICH, A. "Correlates of Superego Functions." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1958.

NEIMAN, L.J. The influence of peer groups upon attitudes toward the feminine role. Soc. Probl., 1954, 2, 104-111.

PARSONS, T. Age and sex in the social structure of the United States. In Parsons, T., Essays in Sociological Theory, Pure and Applied. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949a.

PARSONS, T. Certain primary sources and patterns of aggression in the social structure of the western world. In Parsons, T. Essays in Sociological Theory, Pure and Applied. Glencoe: The Free Press, 1949b.

PAYNE, D.E., AND MUSSEN, P.H. Parent-child relations and father identification among adolescent boys. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1956, 52, 358-362.

RAVEN, B.H., AND FRENCH, J.R.P., JR. Group support, legitimate power, and social influence. J. Pers., 1958, 26, 400-409, a.

RAVEN, B.H., AND FRENCH, J.R.P., JR. Legitimate power, coercive power, and observability in social influence. Sociometry, 1958, 21, 83-97, b.

RIESMAN, D., GLAZER, N., AND DENNEY, R. The Lonely Crowd. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1953.

ROSE, A. Reference groups of rural high school youth. Child Dev., 1956, 27, 351-363.

ROTTER, J.B. Social Learning and Clinical Psychology. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1954.

SCHACTER, S. Deviation, rejection, and communication. In Cartwright, D., and Zander, A. (eds.) Group Dynamics, Research and Theory. Evanston: Row Peterson, 1953.

SEWARD, J.P. Learning theory and identification: II. The role of punishment. J. genet. Psychol., 1954, 84, 201-210.

SIEGEL, S. Nonparametric Statistics for the Behavioral Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1956.

SONTAG, L.W., BAKER, C.T., AND NELSON, V.L. Mental growth and personality development: a longitudinal study. Monogr. Soc. Res. Child Develpm., 1958, 23, No. 2 (Whole No. 68).

SOPCHAK, A.L. Parental "identification" and "tendencies toward disorder" as measured by the MMPI. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 159-165.

WELLS, W.D., WEINERT, G., AND RUBEL, R. Conformity pressure and authoritarian personality. J. Psychol., 1956, 42, 133-136.

WHITING, J.W.M., AND CHILD, I.L. Child Training and Personality: A Cross-Cultural Study. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1953.

WILLEY, C., AND DUNCAN, E. A Study of Adolescent Boys. New Brunswick: University of Michigan, and Boy Scouts of America, 1955.

ZIFF, S. "An Experimental Study of Resistance to Influence." Unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, University of Michigan, 1958.